Values

Halman, L.C.J.M.

Published in:
International encyclopedia of civil society

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

V

Values

Loek Halman
Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

Introduction

In everyday life people value the worth, desirability, utility, quality of things, goods, and actions using certain principles and standards often called values. Values are even considered to be crucial factors in everyday life according to the social sciences. All of them study values using a distinctive theoretical perspective. In economics the value of products, goods, and services are studied in terms of their utility. The economic theory of value is usually equated with the theory of price. In psychology, values are regarded the motivations for behaviors. In sociology values are considered to be social standards or criteria that can serve as selection principles to determine a choice between alternative ways of social action. Sociologists are interested in values as far as they are inherent to social systems, i.e., are culturally or structurally determined, or influence the orientation of collectivities.

The interest in values is not only growing in social science, but also booming in contemporary fast changing societies. For example, in public and political discourses about a (dis)united Europe and its future development, the issue of values has come to the fore. The map of Europe is not only set by its geographical borders, but is more and more defined in the minds of its people. The discussions about Turkey's accession to the European Union center around the assumed differences in fundamental values, while many people fear that a further European unification will gradually dissolve national identity and nationally unique value patterns. Similar questions play at the other side of the Atlantic where the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was established in 1994. Values are considered to have played a key role in this integration process, because "mass values have shaped the politics of continental integration in significant ways and.... Value change among the American, Canadian, and Mexican publics helps to explain why political leaders pursued NAFTA when they did" (Inglehart et al., 1996: 3). At a global scale, there is an intensification of worldwide social relations, international trade and flows of information, which, according to some, will lead to an increasing cosmopolitan outlook and ultimately to a homogenization of cultures and consequently the end of clear distinctive national identities and the gradual disappearance of cross-national differences in fundamental values. The debates about values is further fuelled by the growing concern about the vanishing of certain traditional values and the waning of civic virtuous and community life that are at the core of the "good" society. Many people fear that a growing number of citizens is indifferent about society, and will become too narrowly focused on pure self-interest, being selfish, egoistic, irresponsible, political apathetic and morally obtrusive. For some it is therefore about time that the old "good" virtues and values are restored so that people become "decent" and responsible again, and that institutions and the sense of community are revitalized (Bellah et al., 1986, 1992; Fukuyama, 2000; Etzioni, 1996, 2001).

Values, such as justice, freedom, equality, patriotism, and loyalty, determine what is considered normal and abnormal, decent and indecent, rational and irrational, desirable and undesirable, good and bad or right and wrong. They set goals and define priorities and as such they shape a society's political, social, and economic performance and determine the direction in which these societies are moving (see Harrison & Huntington, 2000). This is not to say that values are the only determining factors or that values cannot be shaped by economic factors, and political and social conditions. Culture, politics, society, and economy are interlinked and changes in one will affect and work back on the other.

Definition

The importance and significance of values may be widely recognized and accepted, less agreement exists on the meaning and reference of the term value. There is no consensual definition of values (Hechter, 1993) and little validated theory has developed on values thus far (Dietz & Stern, 1995: 264; Hechter, 1992, 1993). Values are hard to define properly and the sociological and psychological literature on the subject reveals a real terminological jungle. Lautmann's (1971) inventory of numerous books and

H. Anheier, S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-93996-4,

articles yielded no less than 180 different value definitions. To a large extent, this conceptual confusion is grounded not so much in the nature of values as in the fact that social science studies values as immanent and not, as philosophy and theology do, as transcendent phenomena. One obvious problem in social research is that the values that people hold can only be postulated or inferred, because these values are mental constructs, and therefore are not visible or measurable directly. As Hechter (1993: 3) noted, "values can take many forms, but all of these are unobservable." As a consequence, a value is a more or less open concept. Lacking an empirically grounded theory of values, many efforts have been made to distinguish values from closely-related concepts like attitudes, beliefs, opinions, and so on, which are also of a theoretical nature (Kluckhohn, 1959; Rokeach, 1973; Van Deth & Scarbrough, 1995). There is, however, a common understanding that values are somehow more basic or more existential than its related concepts. Attitudes, for example, are considered to refer to a more restricted complex of objects and/or behaviors than values. This type of theoretical argument assumes a more or less hierarchical structure in which values are more basic than attitudes. "A value is seen to be a disposition of a person just like an attitude, but more basic than an attitude, often underlying it" (Rokeach, 1968: 124). The same applies to the relations between values and theoretical concepts such as norms, beliefs, opinions, and so on.

Most social scientists agree, however, that values are deeply rooted motivations, principles, or orientations guiding, steering, channeling, or explaining certain attitudes, norms, opinions, convictions, and desires which, in turn, direct human action or at least part of it. Values justify, motivate and legitimate human behavior, but they are of a more general nature. Values "define the main directions of action without reference to specific goals or more detailed situations or structures," Parsons claims (1960: 171; see also Kluckhohn, 1959: 395; Rokeach, 1968: 160; 1973: 5). Adhering to a specific value constitutes a disposition, or a propensity to act in a certain way (Halman, 1991: 27; Van Deth & Scarbrough, 1995). Such a definition of values is a functional one and although it is more a description of what values *do* rather than what they actually *are*, it enables one to measure values as latent constructs, that can be observed indirectly, that is, in the way in which people evaluate states, activities, or outcomes.

Historical Background

Although the term "values" is rather recently introduced, what nowadays are identified as values can be recognized in the virtues prevalent in ancient Greek philosophy. Plato's "ideas" and the "virtues" Aristotle distinguished and Stoicism pursued to ultimately achieve happiness defined for a long time in history the good moral life and offered the moral principles to discriminate between right and wrong actions, and good and bad behavior. These ideas were incorporated into Christian moral theology and used in moral philosophy to define and decide on the standards of right and wrong behavior. Virtues had a normative connotation, whereas the term "value" was mainly used in economics to denote utility or preferences and to evaluate the performance of an economy. Nietzche's *Umwertung aller Werte* and Weber's sociology and his idea of "value-freedom" were a kind of starting point for using the term "values" instead of virtue. Their ideas put public morality, and especially Christian morality, into perspective because moral judgments and convictions were considered private matters that could not be justified rationally. Whereas virtues refer to habits or traits that are basically good for you and society, values are intrinsically neither good nor bad. They are neutral in the sense that not necessarily lead to a better or life, decency, or happiness. Values are, however, considered prime motivators of behavior, a characteristic that appears in the works of early sociologists.

Weber's intriguing work on the protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism boosted the awareness that value orientations of mass publics do matter for and in society. Durkeim argued that without consensus or agreement on fundamental values, social solidarity would be threatened, society would become disintegrated and individuals vulnerable to anomie. Earlier Comte and Tocqueville noted that a society or democracy cannot survive if its citizens lack consensus about certain fundamental ideas and beliefs.

The concept of values was further elaborated by scholars like Parsons who regarded values as "modes of normative orientation of action in a social system which define the main directions of action without reference to specific goals or more detailed situations or structures" (Parsons, 1960: 171). Values were attributed significant powers in social life and assumed to be determining and distinguishing factors for human actions. Several attempts were made to measure values empirically, but they were not undisputed, because most of these appeared to be highly selective in the sense that "the researcher knows what to look for beforehand and imposes certain categories of response upon the empirical situation (...). Observable reality is forced into accord with a preconceived model. Thus it is little wonder that functionalist research often finds "evidence" for its concepts: such evidence is never given a chance *not* to appear" (Spates, 1983: 34). Measuring values thus became a major issue and several refinements and new attempts were made to tap them, e.g., by applying content analysis but increasingly also by using survey research. Major contributions were made by Melvin Kohn (1969) and his study of values focusing on self-direction and conformity, and Milton Rokeach (1973) who distinguished expressive from instrumental values.

Despite their efforts, a compelling substantive systematic theory in which values have a place did not develop. The existence of values in people's minds can only be hypothesized, but compelling empirical evidence that they really exist above and beyond people's beliefs, attitudes etc. is still lacking. Also the genesis of values and the process that generates them remain unclear and appear hard to prove empirically. Nevertheless the importance of values for human behaviors is not disputed, but exactly how and to what degree values determine behavior is still ambiguous. Because of this lack of sophisticated theory and decisive empirical support, the little guidance for understanding how values shape human actions, the high level of abstraction, and the problems of measuring them, the interest in values declined for some time (Hechter, 1993; Spates, 1983).

Following the logic of economics, social phenomena became increasingly explained as the result of the rational calculations made by self-interested individuals who aim at maximizing their own individual utility. It was assumed that values only as relative prices and not as moral dispositions play an important role in that decision making process.

In more recent years, however, interest in the cultural factor and thus values rose again, not in the last place because rational choice models could not explain all or even most of individual behaviors. Apparently people are not always only driven by a narrowly conceived self-interest and thus are not always sheer rationally calculating and maximizing their own interests, but act also morally, or on the basis of normative considerations and values. Culture in general and values in particular were once again regarded important sources in human life and treated as a powerful active agent. As Hechter (1992: 227–228) argues, "It is hard to disagree with the sentiment that values deserve a prominent place in the contemporary social scientist's lexicon. Doing without them would challenge many cherished institutions and beliefs."

Key Issues

One of the key issues to be solved in order to achieve progress in the genesis and efficacy of values is the problem of measuring values (see Hechter, 1992: 215). Numerous attempts have been made to achieve that. In the early days, the idea was to simply ask people to describe their own values, or to ask people what their values are, but as Rokeach (1973: 26–27) pointed out "a person might not be willing or able to tell us about them, or he might be highly selective in what he chooses to tell us." Many people will find it extremely difficult to describe their values, even if they know what their values are. Therefore Kluckhohn (1959: 408) suggested focusing on the choices people make, while Dodd (1951) suggested to infer values from asking what people want. Others suggested a more indirect way of measuring values. According to them values are reflected in the media, thus in written documents, biographies, articles in magazines and newspapers, letters, speeches, and states of the union. Others have applied content analyses for analyzing values in this way (for example, refer to Spates 1983; Namenwirth & Weber, 1987). Since the 1950s, the survey instrument became increasingly popular to investigate values among populations.

International Perspectives

The breakthrough of value research came when social and political scientists decided to investigate value differences not only among but also across populations. Almond and Verba's pioneering work on *Civic Culture* examines political values in five countries and is one of the first empirical studies using the recently developed research technology of random sample surveys. They demonstrated convincingly that a particular pattern of orientations to political actions had major implications for the "way the political system operates – to its stability, effectiveness and so forth" (Almond & Verba, 1965: 74). Rokeach (1973) developed a measurement instrument consisting of 36 items that reflect 18 ultimate and 18 existential values. Respondents were asked to rank order these and these rankings appear to vary among different groups of people in different cultures. Hofstede's (1980,1991,2001) international study among IBM employees resulted in five basic dimensions of culture which he considers values. Cultures differ in the degree to which they accept authority and inequality; differ in being individualistic or collectivistic, masculine or feminine; emphasize security and avoid uncertainties, and differ in being more focused on the future or the present. Each nation takes up a distinct position on the scale represented by each dimension (Hofstede, 2001: 29). Shalom Schwartz defines values as the "criteria people use to select and justify actions and to evaluate people (including the self) and events" (Schwartz, 1992: 1). Starting point for Schwartz is a list of ten value types that are recognized by all people across all cultures. These are "power," "achievement," "hedonism," "stimulation," "self-direction," "universalism," "benevolence," "tradition," "conformity," and "security." These "value types" can be confined to two basic orientations: openness to change versus conservation and self-enhancement versus self-transcendence (Schwartz, 1994: 239–243). At the higher level, the level of countries, these ten values can be confined to seven higher order or culture value types. Harry Triandis, another psychologist and pioneer in investigating people's basic values emphasizes the dimension of individualism versus collectivism. "Whether or not cultures are more individualistic or more collectivistic depends on two specific cultural syndromes," according to Triandis (1995: 52), being: "cultural tightness versus looseness, and cultural complexity versus simplicity. The tighter and simpler a culture, the more collectivist it is" (Vinken et al., 2004: 10).

A new step forward was taken when cross-national, repeated collaborative value surveys were fielded from the 1980s on. Especially important are the European Values Study (four waves till now: 1981, 1990, 1999, 2008) and its daughter the World Values Survey (see Halman, 2001; Arts et al., 2003; Arts & Halman, 2004; Halman et al., 2005; Halman et al., 2008; further see www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu). These surveys make it possible to study not only cross-national value differences, but also value changes. Based on the survey data from the European Values Study and/or the World Values Survey, Inglehart (1997) and Hagenaars et al. (2003) distinguish two basic value orientations that reflect two fundamental dimensions of change: the Traditional/Secular-Rational dimension reflecting the contrast between the relatively religious and traditional values that generally prevail in agrarian societies, and the relatively secular, bureaucratic, and rational values that prevail in urban, industrialized societies. The other dimension, Survival/Self-expression, also captures a wide range of beliefs and values, reflecting an intergenerational shift from an emphasis on economic and physical security above all, towards increasing emphasis on concerns of self-expression, subjective well-being, and quality of life. These dimensions appear to be robust aspects of cross-cultural variation, and they enable to locate any society on a two-dimensional map that reflects the societies' relative positions at any given time. Although major changes are occurring along these dimensions, the relative positions of given countries are very stable.

Future Directions

The above mentioned empirical studies provide interesting data, but the different methods employed and different conceptions of values used do not allow, at least for the time being, to compare the dimensions that are distinguished by different social researchers. Although these dimensions appear correlated at the aggregate level, the extent to which they overlap and exactly why they overlap is less clear. Because they are theoretically differently underpinned one of the future directions of value research should be to construct a synthetic theory of value dimensions.

Another future direction would be the solution of measurement problems in survey research. Spates (1983: 41) concluded that because surveys produce mainly descriptive data "they are of limited usefulness to the sociology of values as a field of research," whereas Hechter (1992: 221) argues that questions in a survey are unreliable because "survey instruments generally do not provide the hard choices that are necessary to reveal our immanent choices." They tend to overexeggerate. If values are conceived of as deeply rooted motivations or orientations guiding human action, surveys can be applied. Understood in this way, values may be detected through exploring underlying basic principles guiding a wide variety of behavioral and attitudinal items in a survey. Following Ajzen and Fishbein, one can argue that the number of children in a completed family, the use of birth control pills, visits to a family planning clinic, signing a petition for (or against) legalized abortion, etc., can be explained by a positive or a negative attitude towards family planning (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980: 88). In turn, this attitude may be explained by a more basic value, i.e., a modern or traditional orientation in the domain of family, marriage, and sexuality. So, two different steps can be distinguished in explaining behavior. First, different attitudes explaining several behavioral acts may be found. For instance, one attitude may explain behavior concerning euthanasia, another attitude premarital or extramarital behavior, again another behavior concerning homosexuality and so on. Then, the argument can be taken one step further arguing that all these different attitudes may be explained by a more general underlying guiding principle with a much wider scope. These more general guiding principles can be called *values*, although it must be admitted that the dividing line between attitudes and values in such an approach cannot always be clearly drawn. To elucidate this point could be another future direction.

As argued, values understood in this way may be inferred from a wide variety of behavioral and attitudinal items. Although this presumes that the content of the theoretical construct *value* is sufficiently determined by the behavioral and attitudinal items included in a questionnaire, it justifies to trace what responses have in common, and to regard this common dimension a value (Halman & De Moor, 1994). In terms of analysis, this approach demands a search for latent variables or factors. Numerous statistical techniques are available and widely used to trace underlying factors or orientations, well known under the name of latent structure models. All these techniques have in common the detection of a latent variable explaining the correlations between different behavioral acts, attitudes, opinions, and so on. Put simply: these techniques can be used to detect the underlying orientations in the answers people gave to the questions asked.

Apart from this measurement problem a main issue remains of course that a really convincing and validated theory of values has not been developed yet and that the definition of values is not agreed on. The terminological jungle remains, allowing for different interpretations and appraisals and thus different approaches to investigate them. So this is still another future direction of value research.

Cross-References

- ▶ Altruism
- ▶ Citizenship
- ▶ Civic Culture
- ▶ Civil Society and Culture
- ▶ Civil Society and Religion
- ▶ Durkheim, Emile
- ▶ Etzioni, Amitai
- ▶ Identity
- ▶ Public Value
- ▶ Social Cohesion
- ▶ Weber, Max

References/Further Readings

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.* Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1965). *The civic culture.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Arts, W., & Halman, L. (Eds.) (2004). *European values at the end of the millennium.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Arts, W., Hagenaars, J., & Halman, L. (Eds.) (2003). *The cultural diversity of European unity: Findings, explanations and reflections from the European values study.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1986). *Habits of the heart. Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1992). *The good society.* New York: Vintage Books.

Dietz, T., & Stern, P. C. (1995). Toward a theory of choice: Socially embedded preference construction. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 24,* 261–279.

Dodd, S. C. (1951). On classifying human values: A step in the prediction of human values. *American Sociological Review, 16,* 645–654.

Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule. Community and morality in a democratic society.* New York: Basic Books.

Etzioni, A. (2001). *The monochrome society.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2000). *The great disruption.* New York: Touchstone.

Hagenaars, J., Halman, L., & Moors, G. (2003). Exploring Europe's basic values map. In W. Arts, J. Hagenaars, & L. Halman (Eds.), *The cultural diversity of European unity: Findings, explanations and reflections from the European values study* (pp. 23–58). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Halman, L. (1991). *Waarden in de Westerse wereld (values in the Western world).* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Halman, L. (2001). *The European values study. A third wave.* Tilburg: EVS, WORC, Tilburg University.

Halman, L., & De Moor, R. (1994). Comparative research on values. In P. Ester, L. Halman, & R. De Moor (Eds.), *The individualizing society* (pp. 21–36). Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Halman, L., Luijkx, R., & Van Zundert, M. (2005). *The atlas of European values.* Leiden: Brill.

Halman, L., Inglehart, R., Díez-Medrano, J., Luijkx, R., Moreno, A., & Basáñez, M. (2008). *Changing values and beliefs in 85 countries.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Harrison, L. E., & Huntington, S. P. (Eds.) (2000). *Culture matters. How values shame human progress.* New York: Basic Books.

Hechter, M. (1992). Should values be written out of the social scientist's lexicon?. *Sociological Theory, 10,* 214–230.

Hechter, M. (1993). Values research in the social and behavioral sciences. In M. Hechter, L. Nadel, & R. E. Michod (Eds.), *The origin of values* (pp. 1–28). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences. International differences in workrelated values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organization. Software of the mind.* London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Cultures consequences. Comparing values, behaviors, institutions across nations.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R., Nevitte, N., & Basañez, M. (1996). *The North American trajectory.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Kluckhohn, C. (1959). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388–433). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kohn, M. (1969). *Class and conformity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lautmann, R. (1971). *Wert und Norm: Begriffsanalysen für die Soziologie.* Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag.

Namenwirth, J. Z., & Weber, R. P. (1987). *Dynamics of culture.* Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies.* Glencoe: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes and values.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values. Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1–66). New York: Academic 239– 243.

Schwarz, S. (1994). Studying human values. In A. M. Bouvy, F. van de Vijver, M. Boski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.), *Journeys into Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 239–254). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Spates, J. L. (1983). The sociology of values. *Annual Review of Sociology, 9*, 27–49.

Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Van Deth, J. W., & Scarbrough, E. (1995). The concept of values. In J. W. van Deth & E. Scarbrough (Eds.), *The impact of values* (pp. 21–47). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vinken, H., Soeters, J., & Ester, P. (2004). Cultures and dimensions. Classic perspectives and new opportunities in 'Dimensionalists' cross-cultural studies. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, & P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures. Dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp. 5–27). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Venture Philanthropy

Giuliana Gemelli
Universita di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

Introduction

After the 1990s, the new economy – generated by high-tech and Internet business companies – produced enormous wealth in the US. The main difference vis-à-vis the previous generation of business leaders was related to the fact that the new generation was much younger and determined to leave an impact on society beyond the boundaries of business. The interest of the common business people in giving practices was concentrated on generating social impact rather than on simply defining grant-making programs. When they became involved in philanthropy, new rich entrepreneurs came up with new ideas and jargon, using terms such as social venture, high-engagement philanthropy, strategic philanthropy, scientific philanthropy, effective philanthropy, and philanthropic investments; they used acronyms such as SROI (social return on investment) and revealed a special taste for measurement (Council of Foundations, 2001; John, 2006). Actually, these terms were not totally new and in some cases had long-term historical roots. What was really new was rather the context in which these concepts "re-emerged" and were applied to philanthropy.

Definition

From the 1990s onward there were several attempts to define venture philanthropy, but there seems to be evidence that a universal understanding about the concept doesn't exist. Usually, the concept refers to the application of venture capital practices in order to strengthen the role of philanthropy actors both on the side of the donors as well as on the side of the recipients. The most relevant aspect of the dissemination of venture philanthropy practices is the strengthening of the relationship between actors who were originally "distant" or even "separated" in the framework of the traditional practice of grant-making, which mainly characterized the modus operandi of American style foundations. It is a matter of fact that tradition and innovation are not separated in the context of venture philanthropy: some historical case studies – not only in the US but also in Europe – reveal that the issues of taking risk and generating reciprocity between the donors and the receiver were at work since the late nineteenth century. Moreover if we analyze some religious traditions we can stress the fact that the practice of empowering society and individuals rather than simply "giving through charitable acts" is a recurrent aspect of philanthropic traditions.

In order to situate the present debate it is important to set up some definitions (See Table 1).

These definitions despite their different characterization have a common background: venture philanthropy has grown out of the desire of individuals and foundations to use a venture capital model to strengthen the capacity of charitable organizations. Jed Emerson, the inspirer of the Blended Value proposition (www.blendevalues.org) has characterized traditional philanthropy as "Transactional Philanthropy," a philosophy of giving that distributes available resources as widely as possible. The usual foundation policy is a plethora of one-year grants and a primarily program-oriented giving focus that neglects building up organizational infrastructure. Venture philanthropy reflects the needs of a new emerging goal of philanthropy – capacity building. It looks at a new generation of entrepreneurs who want to make their capabilities effective at the social level.

Venture philanthropy focuses on building up organizational capacity using multiyear grants and strengthening technical assistance. Its donors look for entrepreneurial skills and opportunities within the organizations and aim to increase their organizational sustainability. Venture philanthropy looks at long-term investment instead of short-term granting policies. Table 2 summarizes the key distinctions between older giving patterns and the newer patterns of venture philanthropy.

One of the first examples of how venture philanthropy works can be retraced in the experience of the Roberts Foundation of San Francisco (http://redf.org), which uses the venture capital model to directly support a portfolio of entrepreneurial nonprofit social enterprises. The Foundation provides technical assistance, specifically designed for each project, and mobilizes groups of volunteers,

Venture Philanthropy. Table 1 Selected Definitions

Source	Definition
John, R. EVPA (2006)	"Venture Philanthropy is defined primarily by the relatively high level of engagement of the founder in the organisation being supported, over an extended time period, injecting skills or services in addition to finance."
Cleaves, P. (2005)	"It is an investment and relationship strategy that combines practices of venture capital models of the for-profit sector with the principles and public-benefit missions of the non-profit sector."
Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors www.rockpa.org	"An outcomes-driven mode of giving that seeks to increase the capacity of the grantees to deliver superior results"
Ashoka – Innovators for the Public www.ashoka.org	"It is defined as philanthropy which uses some of the best practices of the venture capital world, measuring the value of the donor dollar in terms of the social return of investment, to effectively build the capacity of citizen-sector organizations".
European Venture Philanthropy Association www.evpa.eu.com	"It is an Approach to charitable giving that applies venture capital principles – such as long-term investment and hands-on support – to the citizen sector."
Morino Institute www.morino.org	"It is the process of adapting strategic investment management practices to the non-profit sector to build organisations able to generate high social rates of return on their investments. Strategic management assistance is provided to leverage and augment the financial investment made. This approach is modelled after the high end of venture capital investors – the relatively few who work to build great organisations instead of just providing capital."
Social Venture Partners www.svpi.org	"Venture Philanthropy takes some of the principles of venture capitalism and applies them to philanthropy. Venture Philanthropy is the process whereby, (usually wealthy) individuals invest time and money in voluntary organisations and social enterprises. Venture Philanthropy means funding organizations with not only financial resources, but also management and technical support. This support is focused on enabling nonprofits to build greater organizational capacity and infrastructure via long term, engaged relationships with investees."

business advisors, MBA interns, and Roberts business staff.

In the last ten years the followers of this models proliferate not only in the US but also in Europe and Latin America. They agree on some specific issues and practices such as:

- Identifying social entrepreneurs who demonstrate commitment and creativity
- Selecting organizations through rigorous due diligence
- Investing resources for organizational capacity building
- Providing strategic advisorship for sustainability strategy
- Focusing on "social return" and accountability to the investors
- Planning exit strategies.

The paradox of venture philanthropy is that is represented as a total innovation, but if one looks deeply into the oldest traditions of philanthropy, it is quite evident that its main principles and patterns are deeply rooted in the past. A relevant example, among others, is the Maimonides principles of Jewish philanthropy, which were defined in the Middle Age. The ideal stage of philanthropy, according to Maimonides, is to enter into a partnership with those who receive the gift. You must place yourself on equal dialogue with the recipient and work together toward the same aim. And Maimonides says the aim of the highest pattern of philanthropic action is not giving but **generating** social justice through action.

The focus is on what happens to the giver and what happens to the relationships among human beings when a gift is given. While attending to a material need these patterns also are directed toward a spiritual transformation, which implies above all the profound commitment to the human spirit of mutual support.

Venture Philanthropy. Table 2 Patterns of Giving: Traditional vs. Venture Philanthropy

Old patterns of giving	Seeds of Change
Giving by compassion and subsidiary	**Giving "by design," creativity and responsibility**
Giving primarily later in life	Giving throughout life
Foundations as the key institutions form	Foundations as one form among other (individuals, venture funds)
Social benefit equals the non profit sector	Social benefit can come from any other sector
Philanthropy corrects for the market because the market is part of the problem	Philanthropy connects to the market because the market can produce a part of the solution
Donors focus on their local communities	Donors focus both at local level as well in a global dimension of social problems
Donors make grants	Donors make investments through grants
Money is the resource and the only tool	Money is just one tool. Competence and influence are the resource. Knowledge is an asset
Donors keep grantees at army's length	Donors highly engaged in developing partnerships
Donors give independently	Donors give independently and give together. Philanthropy mutual funds
Project based – not core funding	Funds general operations rather than projects
Short-term up to 3 years as a standard policy	Long-term investment
No exit strategy-opaque performance criteria	Promote financial self-sufficiency as "exit strategy"
Routine management and administration of application and evaluation methods to select recipients	Leadership capable of responding and managing organizational change, development strategies, cooperation systems, devising, and monitoring performances
By-out of already consolidated external projects and avoid risk	Spread risks across a collection of diverse investment, considering the full spectrum of assets they have available
Uneven relations-division of labor between the donor who gives and the recipient who does	Equal partnership in achieving a variety of financial and social goals

Historical Background

The term Venture Philanthropy appears for the first time around 1969, in the speech of John D. Rockefeller III to the American House of Representatives, in the period during which Tax Reform Act was under discussion:

- Private foundations often are established to engage in what has been described as 'venture philanthropy,' or the imaginative pursuit of less conventional charitable purposes than those normally undertaken by established public charitable organizations". (Rockefeller, 1969. Quoted in D. Carrington, 2003 ACF Conference)

At that time, Rockefeller used the term "venture" to underline the role of private foundations and their capacity to act as risk taking organizations.

In 1984, the annual report of the Peninsula Community Foundation (which later on merged into the Silicon Valley Community Foundation) mentioned "venture philanthropy" with a focus on "high-engaged approach" based on five key issues:

1. Investment in the long term (3–6 year business plans)
2. Strong partnership between the donor and the nonprofit organization
3. Accountability-for-results process
4. Provision of grants and expertise
5. Exit Strategy.

In 1997 a seminal article by Letts, Ryan, and Grossman, "Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists," originally published in the *Harvard Business Review* gave the concept of venture philanthropy an academic legitimacy and marked the starting point of an increasingly large-scale debate which combined practical and theoretical issues.

This article inspired some foundations in the US to change their approach towards a more engaged system of practices and generated debate about the use of profit-like tools in the nonprofit sector. One of the first organizations to develop the practice of the theoretical orientation framed by Letts and colleagues was again the

Peninsula Community Foundation. It is a matter of fact that in the US, venture philanthropists were frequently also founders of community foundations.

At the beginning of the new millennium this problematical approach crossed the Atlantic and became a framework of debate also in Europe. In 2006 the European Venture Philanthropy Association (EVPA) was created. In few years the association grew rapidly in membership and impact.

Key Issues

One of the most relevant aspects of venture philanthropy seen from a critical perspective is its close link with business models. The main risk is an effect of mesmerization of the inputs given by the venture philanthropy approach to innovation practices in the traditional field of business practices and models. This risk has been emphasized by the increasing interlink between venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship. This process implies an innovation effect in terms of implementing social and intellectual capital of social entrepreneurship, as is the case of some leading social venture philanthropy organizations. However, it also entails the risk that this model is monopolized by the business schools that are able to reproduce the pattern in the framework of the mental map of business practices.

Considered in itself, venture philanthropy is neither a panacea for the main issues that concern the changing patterns of philanthropy in the present nor a set of practices that just enhance the narcissistic behaviour of the new philanthropists eager to perceive the effect of their action in changing the world.

It is rather the symptom of the necessity of bypassing the old categories that we received for the last century and to shape these patterns in order to meet the new issues. The main goals are to create a new capital market for philanthropy and to generate the consciousness that the wealthiest people in the world should work to combine the impetus for the application of wealth with the need to support the development of effective responses to social needs. There is nothing really new in this if we recall the famous dictum from Karl Polanyi that stresses a simple fact: no ruling class can be really dominant if it contemplates only its own interest and does not conceive any kind of concern and support to the needs of the other non-ruling classes and social groups.

From this point of view venture philanthropy recalls an old issue with a new concern: the necessity to bypass the standardized classification between sectors and the mythology of the existence of a third sector separated from the other.

The discussion is open. As in the old tradition of Alvin Johnson (the editor of the Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences) and Lucien Febvre (the editor of the Encyclopedie Française) who are both the modern brokers of ideas for the new encyclopaedic enterprises of the last century, this is still a challenge to be met in the new millennium, particularly in the frame of an international encyclopaedia of civil society.

Future Directions

Over the past few decades, the boundaries between the public (government), private (business), and social (nonprofit/nongovernmental) sectors have been blurring while a new class of organization has been emerging. It has produced what can be denominated the fourth dimension of philanthropy, which is driven by social forces, is socially, ethically, and environmentally responsible, but at the same time is economically self-sustaining. Like a nonprofit, this new dimension of philanthropy can sustain a large variety of social purposes and missions. Like a for-profit it can generate a large range of products and services, improving educational programs, creating new jobs and new products, maximizing the benefits for stakeholder, while investing in social purpose and developing patterns of responsible, accountable behavior among partners from different institutional, social, and economic backgrounds, as well as from different disciplines and expertise frameworks. We can eventually call this emerging framework "For-Benefits." It represents a new paradigm in organizational design. At all levels, they aim to link two concepts, that are held as a false dichotomy in other models: private interest and public benefit, which also represent the oldest historical roots of philanthropy in many different cultural and religious traditions.

Whether in response to intrinsic values, stakeholder pressures, or market opportunities, pioneering organizations across all sectors and disciplines have been transforming themselves and adopting new models and approaches that challenge traditional paradigms. Some of these models and innovations include among others:

- Base of the Pyramid Strategies
- Civic Enterprises
- Community Development Corporations (CDC)
- Community Development Financial Institutions
- Corporate-Nonprofit Partnerships
- Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)
- Double- or Triple-Bottom Line Accounting
- Employee Ownership.

Venture Philanthropy could be a relevant element in all of these models, but it is not the panacea that assures their effectiveness.

Cross-References

- ▶ Accountability
- ▶ Blended Value
- ▶ Corporate Social Responsibility
- ▶ Foundations, Community
- ▶ Philanthropy and Religion, Judaism
- ▶ Polanyi, Karl
- ▶ Social Accounting for Social Economy Organizations
- ▶ Social Entrepreneurship
- ▶ Social Enterprise
- ▶ Social Investment
- ▶ Strategic Philanthropy

References/Further Readings

Alexeeva, O. (2007). *Philanthrocapitalism: Myth or reality? New philanthropy: A micro-world of busy youngsters.* Articolo pubblicato nella Alliance Magazine, March 2007. In: http://www.allavida.org/alliance/mar07e.html

Baxter, CI. (1997). *A basic guide to program-related investments.* The Grantsmanship Center Magazine. Edizione di Autunno 1997.

Bishop, M. (2006). *The birth of philanthrocapitalism.* The Economist survey of wealth and philanthropy. The Economist Newspaper Limited, London, February 23rd.

Cardis, J., Kirschner, S., Richelson, S., Kirschner, J., Richelson, H. (2001). *Venture capital: The definitive guide for entrepreneurs, investors, and practitioners.* New York, Wiley.

Carrington, D. (2003). *Venture philanthropy: A new concept or an old idea re-wrapped?* Presentazione alla conferenza della ACF - Association of Charitable Foundations. Nottingham, UK in aprile 2003. http://www.davidcarrington.net/articles/docs/acf_venture.doc.

Cleaves, P. (2005). *Venture philanthropy: Origins & experiences.* Meeting of the Association of Fund Raising Professionals, Austin, Texas. July 2005. In: http://www.afpaustin.org/site/DocServer/Microsoft_PowerPoint_-_Venture_Philanthropy_July_05_AFP_.pdf?docID = 881.

Council of Foundations. (2001). *Venture philanthropy: A model of innovation vs. A model of intrusion.* Board Briefing: Venture Philanthropy, February 2001. In: http://www.cof.org/files/Documents/Governing_Boards/bb2venturephil.pdf.

Edwards Michael, *Just another emperor. The myth and realities of philanthrocapitalism.* In http://www.justanotheremperor.org/

Gemelli, G (a cura di) (2004). *Filantropia di Ventura. Rischio, responsabilità, riflessività nell'agire filantropico.* Legacy of MISP. Baskerville Unipress, Bologna, Italia.

Grenier, P. Something ventured? The emergence of venture philanthropy in Europe, Paper n. PA061312 http://arnova.omnibooksonline.com/2006/data/papers/PA061312.pdf.

Grenier, P., *Venture philanthropy in Europe: Obstacles and opportunities EVPA, January 2006, http://www.evpa.eu.com/downloads/EVPA_Research_Report_January_2006_Summary.pdf.*

John, R. (2006). *Venture philanthropy: The evolution of high engagement philanthropy in Europe.* Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship. Working Paper. Oxford University Press.

Kramer, M., & Porter, M. (1999). *Philanthropy's new agenda: Creating value.*Harvard Business Review, November/December 1999. Available at: http://www.ncbf.org/Philanthropys_New_Agenda.pdf.

Letts, C., Ryan, W., Grossman, A. (1997). *Virtuous capital: What foundations can learn from venture capitalists.* Harvard Business Review, March/April 1997.

Morino Institute. (2000). *Venture philanthropy: Landscape and expectations.* Produced for the Morino Institute Youth Social Ventures by Community Wealth Ventures, Inc.

Price, W. (2007). *Introduction to venture capital.* 2007. Presentazione alla Stanford University. Hummer Winblad Venture Partners, Marzo 2007.

Schervish, P., O'herlihy, M., & Havens, J. (2001). *Agent-animated wealth and philanthropy: The dynamics of accumulation and allocation among high-tech donors.* Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College.

University Of Pennsylvania. (2004). *Does venture philanthropy work?* Wharton School, May 8, 2004. In: http://news.com.com/2030-1030_3-5206330.html.

Venture Philanthropy Partners. (2003). *High –engagement Grantmaker Survey Results and profiles.* VPP report 2002. In: http://vppartners.org/learning/reports/report2002/profiles.pdf.

Volkswagen Stiftung

Alexia Duten

Address of Organization

Kastanienallee 35
30519 Hannover
Germany
www.volkswagenstiftung.de

Introduction

The Volkswagen Stiftung (hereafter also: Volkswagen Foundation) is the largest private foundation supporting research in Germany. It is an independent and autonomous foundation and no subsidiary of the automobile giant VW.

Brief History

After the Second World War, investigations started concerning the ownership of Volkswagen, for a handful of reasons. "Volkswagen" was, before it became its own brand, a type of car (literally "the people's car") considered to be low budget cars accessible to the broad public. Employed by Hitler in his campaign for mass motorisation, it drew its capital from the confiscation of trade unions' budgets and the collection of saving for the alleged "people's car." Production never really started in the factory ("Volkswagenwerk") located in Wolfsburg in Lower Saxony.

After World War II, the Volkswagenwerk was placed in the hands of the British. Ambiguous regulations led to a decade-long ownership battle. Final ownership was settled (although ownership doubts never really dissolved) by the Federal Republic of Germany, and the state of Lower Saxony. The two parties agreed on putting 60% of the company's shares onto the stock market and to launch a science foundation from its benefits. The foundation was officially created in 1961 and started its funding activities the following year. First called "Stiftung Volkswagenwerk," the foundation was renamed Volkswagen Stiftung in 1989.

Mission

The "foundation of knowledge," as the Volkswagen Stiftung likes to qualify itself, focuses on "forward-looking fields of research" in all disciplines and is particularly fond of providing grants for projects with intercultural or interdisciplinary approaches.

Activities

Since the foundation is not dependent on the benefits of the company but of its own investments and capital, it is autonomous and independent in its funding choices. The Volkswagen Stiftung concentrates on a limited number of projects, especially within social sciences and humanities and makes sure they become core references by the time their grant ends. It made a point of honor in funding initiatives enriching the education and research structures in Germany.

Structure and Governance

The Volkswagen Foundation statute of a nonprofit foundation under German private law also guarantees its independence from the Volkswagen Company. The executive committee is a "Kuratorium," consisting of 14 members, half of them appointed by the Land of Lower Saxony, the other half by the German Federal Government.

Funding

The Volkswagen Stiftung was designed for funding science and research in Germany.

The foundation's capital amounted to €2.4 billion in 2008. Returns on investments of that sum constitute the available funding volume. More than 90 employees work towards allocating and multiplying the most important private budget dedicated to research every year. Indeed, the Volkswagen Stiftung is announcing a total grant volume of over €100 million per annum.

Accomplishments

In 46 years of existence, the Volkswagen Foundation has funded nearly 30,000 projects representing a funding volume of over €3.35 billion. It is the largest nonprofit foundation funding science projects under private law in Germany and a reference in the academic world.

Cross-References

► Foundations, Independent

References/Further Readings

Nicolaysen, R. (2002). *Der Lange Weg zur VolkswagenStiftung*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Voluntary Sector Compacts

Marilyn Taylor
University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

Introduction

The idea of a Compact – as a framework of the principles governing relations between government and the voluntary and community sector (VCS) – first took root in the United Kingdom in the late 1990s and has come to be understood as an agreement between the sectors with guidelines on how the two sectors should work together. Taken up with enthusiasm in 1997 by the New Labour government there, it was an idea that attracted interest from a number of other countries, some of whom – such as Canada – had already been thinking along similar lines. For advocates of the idea, the Compact represents an important recognition by the state of the contribution that the sector makes to society. It has the potential to increase understanding between the two sectors, as well as protecting the independence of voluntary and community organizations (VCOs) at a time when they are becoming increasingly central to market-style welfare reforms. But critics see it as marking the co-option of the sector into government agendas and the privatization of welfare or, alternatively, as a symbolic gesture with no real teeth.

This entry will focus largely on the English Compact as the earliest and most comprehensive example of a Compact, but draw on experience elsewhere to illustrate what has been learnt so far about their relevance, implementation, and effectiveness.

Definition

The English Compact (Home Office, 1998) has been defined by government as an agreement between government and the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to improve their relationship for mutual advantage and community gain. It underlines government's commitment to the sector, recognizes its "fundamental" contribution to a democratic, socially inclusive society and sets out guidelines for how both parties should work together. Launched in 1998, with parallel agreements in the other UK countries, it consists of a framework of principles with five codes of practice: on funding and procurement; consultation and policy appraisal; volunteering; Black and minority ethnic voluntary and community organizations (VCOs); and community organizations. The Compact contains undertakings from both government and the VCS, and on government's side, applies to all central government departments as well as nondepartmental public bodies that have a relationship with the VCS. In addition, by April 2008, all but 11 local authority areas in England were covered by a Local Compact, typically with all public bodies signed up through the Local Strategic Partnership – a multi-agency nonstatutory partnership that exists in each English local authority area. Compacts were being developed in the remaining areas.

The national Compact is reviewed at an annual Ministerial meeting which reports to Parliament. A Commission for the Compact oversees the Compact and its codes of practice, in partnership with government's Office of the Third Sector, which represents the interests of government departments, and Compact Voice, which represents the interests of the VCS. A Compact Advocacy Program takes up cases of noncompliance and uses its casework to campaign for long-term change.

The Compact idea has been taken up in a number of countries beyond the United Kingdom. The English Compact website reports that 25 countries showed interest when the Compact was first launched and, although there is no comprehensive list, there appear to be Compact-like provisions in Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, France, New Zealand and Poland. Drafts are in place in Hungary, Slovenia, and Sweden, while a change of government in 2007 has brought the Compact onto the agenda in Australia. The nature of these agreements varies considerably in terms of length and coverage. Some are better described as government policies or general statements of intention (e.g., New Zealand); others consist largely of government commitments towards the VCS (e.g., the Welsh Voluntary Sector Scheme). There is also interest in a compact-style agreement at supranational level in the European Union. The position regarding local Compacts is less clear. It is likely that the countries of the United Kingdom are the most advanced in this regard, with the idea of regional Compacts also under discussion in England, but Compact style agreements are also in place in some Canadian states. In the absence of a federal initiative, all Australian states have developed some kind of agreement, although these are rarely comprehensive.

Historical Background

The proposal for an English Compact was first made by an independently funded Commission on the Future of the Voluntary Sector, commonly known – after its Chair – as the Deakin Commission. One of the main recommendations of this Commission was for a "concordat" between government and the VCS to lay down basic principles for future relations. While this proposal was rejected by the Conservative government of the day, it was picked up with enthusiasm by the main opposition party – New Labour – which committed itself to a "compact" in its preelection statement in 1997. On coming to power later that year, it set up a Ministerial Taskforce to progress the idea. At the same time, an independent VCS Working Party on Government Relations was set up, chaired by an influential ex-civil servant, Sir Kenneth Stowe, and this, with its wider reference group of some 100 VCOs, became the primary channel for negotiations with government. After a multi-layered consultation exercise which is said to have involved some 25,000 organizations, the national Compact was published in the autumn of 1998. Four of the five national codes of practice followed in 2000 and 2001, with the fifth – on Community Groups – published 2 years later in 2003. Parallel compacts and codes of practice were also developed in the other UK administrations.

For many VCOs, the principal contact with government is at local level and the idea of Local Compacts was gaining ground even before the National Compact was signed. A survey in 1998 indicated that a growing number of local authorities had or were developing some kind of agreement with the local VCS at that time, while the first local Compact as such in England was published by Dorset County Council in 1999. Local Compact development was strongly encouraged by national government and Local Compact Guidelines were published in 2000. Again, this process was mirrored in the other UK countries.

Despite the high profile given to the Compact, early evaluations reported disappointing progress, nationally and locally. In 2002, therefore, a Treasury-led review reaffirmed government's commitment to the Compact. Champions were appointed at a senior level in each government department and government regional offices. The annual meeting with Ministers, meanwhile, set deadlines for local authorities to have a published Local Compact and a Compact Advocacy Program was introduced in 2003. However, reviews continued to report slow progress and low levels of awareness and, in 2007, the Commission for the Compact was launched as a Nondepartmental Public Body – at arm's length from government – to oversee Compact implementation. The VCS Working Party on Government Relations was meanwhile relaunched in 2006 as Compact Voice – a Local Compact Voice network had been established in 2004.

Key Issues

Much of the research evidence on Compacts to date comes from the UK countries and Canada, so the following discussion is based largely on experience in these countries. Hard research evidence on their impact is difficult to find. Compacts have generally been part of a wider policy process and any change in relationships or in government practice would be hard to attribute solely to their influence. While there are positive stories to tell, however, the evidence still suggests that there is a sizeable gap between the intentions of the Compact and practice on the ground (Plowden, 2003). In 2003, 5 years after the launch of the English Compact, a review suggested there were few concrete outcomes, while more recent research continues to report patchy implementation (Craig et al., 2005). Continuing evidence of a widespread lack of awareness of its existence or implications, or its low priority in relation to other policy imperatives, indicates the scale of the challenges still being faced. Issues like full cost recovery, length of contract, adequate time for consultation and prompt payment, which feature in the English codes of practice, are still subjects for concern in the VCS – more honored in the breach than the observance according to a recent Green Paper by the Conservative party. In one recent study by Compact Voice, only 30% of respondents viewed the Compact as "important" or "very important"; a quarter felt it was completely ineffectual or irrelevant. The Canadian Accord meanwhile is said to have produced disappointing results so far.

Nonetheless, there are many Compact advocates. In areas where relationships between the sectors are good, research suggests that it can help to cement and spread good practice. Successive studies attest to the value of the process of agreeing a Compact for establishing trust and understanding between the sectors, as well as awareness on the government side of the value of the VCS contribution. The publicity attached to such agreements raises the profile of the VCS and even in Canada where commentators report disappointing progress on the Accord, Kathy Brock (2008) suggests that there have been important shifts in attitudes and in the nature of the debate, which may bear fruit in the future. This may well be the case elsewhere.

The key issues which are raised by research so far can be divided into three: substantive debates about the nature of the Compact; challenges and persistent barriers to effectiveness; and lessons from the ground on the factors that help to make a Compact work.

Substantive Debates

Probably the two major substantive issues raised by the Compact as a policy instrument relate to its legal status and its impact on VCS independence.

Legal Status

In most of the countries that have Compact-style agreements (Poland is the main exception), the agreement is not enshrined in law. This is an issue that has prompted considerable debate. Many point to the slow progress on Compact agreement and implementation as evidence that legal status is essential along with the sanctions it entails if the Compact is to become more than a piece of paper, especially given the many competing priorities that all partners face. Indeed, both main political parties in England have called for measures to improve enforcement and its legal status is now under review. However, others endorse the looser, more flexible status of most Compacts albeit with robust systems for review and mediation. Thus, in Wales, whose Voluntary Sector Scheme contains a range of government commitments towards the sector, commentators have argued that it is the intensive contact between the sectors that is designed into the Scheme that is the best guarantor of success, meaning that issues can be dealt with informally before they become major problems. Here legislation has created a Voluntary Sector Partnership Council which meets four times a year with Welsh Assembly Members and Ministers and in addition each Minister is expected to meet twice a year with relevant VCS networks in their field. In England, too, there are systems to address compliance, including the Annual Ministerial Meeting and Report to Parliament, with its Action Plan against which the following year's progress can be assessed, and the Compact Advocacy Program. The latter can claim some notable successes in changing practice at national and local level, having handled over 100 cases and saved over £40 million for the sector. However, attendance at the annual Ministerial Meeting is reported to be variable, while a proposed kite-marking scheme has not yet been implemented. On the other hand, in principle at least, the existence or otherwise of a working Compact is taken into account in dealings between central and local government, providing a useful benchmark in relation to assessments of local authority performance or allocation of funds.

Co-option

Another key debate in relation to the Compact relates to independence. In 2001, an influential commentator, Ralf Dahrendorf, counselled firmly against "the embrace of the state," warning that the "independence that is the oxygen of charity" would be "stifled by the flirtation with political power." A number of academic articles argued a similar case: a recent discussion paper for the Australian Institute doubted whether a Compact would provide long-term solutions to the relationship predicament between government and the nongovernmental sector there (Edgar, 2008). In a contract culture, some saw the Compact as a way in which the state was creating a "manageable terrain of governance," drawing on Foucauldian ideas about the persistence of state power and state agendas in new forms of governance (Morison, 2000; Carmel and Harlock, 2008).

On the other hand, a commitment to the independence of the VCS has been at the heart of the English Compact, which recognizes the right of VCOs to criticize government policy even when in receipt of government funding. Research suggests that the Compact has been welcomed by many VCOs at local level as a way of increasing the local state's understanding of the nature and potential of VCS activity and also of the need for independence. The point has also been made that, although the English Compact contains undertakings from both government and the VCS, many agreements focus solely on government commitments, with little emphasis on what the VCS should do in return. Even in the English Compact, the commitments from government outweigh those from the VCS.

Challenges and Barriers

Even with the high-level commitment to the national Compact in England and the shared values that underpinned its negotiation, progress there has been slow. But sustaining commitment to the Compact process over time is a major challenge. A change in government can act as a spur to Compact development: in England, the Compact only became possible with the advent of the New Labour government and the same applies to the Rudd government in Australia. But a change of government can also cause the Compact to fall off the agenda. The French Charter lost momentum with the change of government in 2002, while, in New South Wales, a change of leader, even with the same party in power, meant the Compact was no longer a priority there. In the United Kingdom, local government reorganization and redrawn boundaries often triggered Compact development, but Craig et al., 2002, 2005 also found cases where momentum had been lost with a change in political administration. They suggested that the relationship between key players was pivotal – Compact development was often disrupted when a key player moved on. Their research also showed that despite the national commitment to the Compact, the pace of policy change under New Labour meant that Local Compact development was often put on the back burner as more urgent demands came from central government. Compacts were competing for attention in a very crowded policy environment.

A second challenge is reach: a common finding in many evaluations has been that awareness of the Compact does not reach far enough beyond the key players on either side. The need to improve communication is a perennial feature on Compact Action Plans and the difficulties of reaching smaller and BME organizations were recognized in the English Compact by the negotiation of additional codes of practice for these two parts of the sector. Related to this is the issue of mainstreaming. Compact practice needs to be institutionalized within the working of every public body and policy if it is not to be dependent on political whim or the competence and interest of individual officers.

A third challenge relates to culture change. If the Compact is to be effective and to respect the independence of the third sector, then public sector cultures need to change. The evidence so far is that it is very difficult to transform relations where there is a legacy of mistrust – there is an argument that the Compact is most successful where it is least needed. Recent studies underline the need for training and for policies and structures within the state to be Compact-proofed (Craig et al., 2005). Problems may also arise if the process is seen to be too one-sided. There are examples where state actors have drafted Compacts without consulting with the VCS. These are unlikely to gain much confidence. But seeing Compacts solely in terms of their impact on state attitudes and operations is also unlikely to be satisfactory and could be seen as contrary to the spirit of the Compact – despite the difficulties of securing compliance in a diverse VCS. The disappointing trajectory of developments that many Canadian commentators observe has been attributed to the fact that government and the VCS there were working to different agendas.

Finally, the complexity of the endeavor needs to be acknowledged. If progress has been slow, this is in no small part due to the complexity of both sectors and the relationship between them.

Success Factors

The research so far identifies a number of factors as necessary to the successful development and implementation of Compacts. These include:

Communication

Implementation and the confidence of both sectors depends on individuals beyond the key players being aware of the provisions of the Compact and being willing to refer to the Compact when things go wrong. Case studies of successful mediation and Compact "wins" also increase confidence and give it teeth.

Monitoring and review

Compact momentum can flag once an agreement is signed. Regular review is essential both to keep the agreement alive and to address noncompliance.

Resources

Effective communication and review require resources, especially if Compact awareness is to reach all parts of both sectors – particularly important are resources for the VCS infrastructure to raise awareness of the Compact in all parts of the sector and ensure that it is both used and effectively monitored.

Champions

At the same time, commitment to the Compact needs to be championed in government – research has suggested that leadership at a high level makes a difference as well as the appointment of champions with the status, responsibility and resources to promote Compact awareness and compliance.

Embedding within mainstream structures and processes

Compact compliance cannot depend on individual awareness – structures and policies need to be Compact proofed. Conversely, the Compact needs to be integrated with government structures and processes, including commissioning and procurement, if it is to become part of government's core business.

Political support

Cross-party support is essential if the Compact is not to be derailed by a change of government. It is also important to ensure that national and local politicians understand and support the Compact.

A multilevel approach

If Compact compliance it to be mainstreamed it needs compliance at all levels and in all parts of government. Otherwise good practice in one part of government will easily be cancelled out by competing demands elsewhere.

Both comprehensive and focused

Broad principles need to be translated into firm commitments if the Compact is to make a difference – the devil is likely to be in the detail. But focusing purely on some aspects of the relationship or particular policy fields can limit its usefulness. Some Compacts have focussed mainly on funding. While this is important, it can also reinforce a narrow interpretation of the Compact as being mainly about service delivery or state-funded organizations. A positive understanding of the role of the sector in the democratic process is equally important if the sector is to thrive. Similarly while it is useful to look at how the Compact can be applied to particular policy fields, specialist agreements need to be based in an overall framework that can cut across specialisms. A holistic approach is needed, especially for the many VCOs which work across policy fields and the boundaries of government departments.

A long-term view

The slow progress of the Compact even in England suggests that Compact development and implementation is a long-term endeavor. It helps to build quick practical wins into Compact development – they can build support for the Compact – but a long-term commitment is essential.

Relevance to the local context

The UK national Compacts have often been used as templates in other countries and for Local Compacts. But experience suggests that simply transferring the words from one policy context to another is not enough. It short circuits the process of mutual understanding and debate that is a crucial feature of the Compact and may fail to address key local issues and legacies.

Future Directions

There are still mixed views as to the value of the Compact. Depending on the context within which it operates, it can act as a thermometer against which to assess the health of the relationship, a lever for change where this is necessary, a rallying point, and a longstop or a "life-belt" if all else fails. Research suggests that history is important. Compacts have been most successful in localities and policy areas where good relationships between the sectors have built up over time. But does this mean that Compacts most likely to be successful where they are least needed? There are doubts as to how far a Compact on its own can turn around a relationship that is not working. On the other hand it is essential to take a long-term view. It is possible to argue that the success of the Compact will only become apparent when it is not needed any more. Until then, the importance of smaller incremental changes and changes in understanding for those who benefit from them should not be underestimated.

Cross-References

► Dahrendorf, Ralf
► Government–Nonprofit Sector Relations
► National Council for Voluntary Organizations
► Third Way

References/Further Readings

Brock, K. (2008, June). *Policy windows and policy failures: Using kingdon to explain the later life cycle of the voluntary sector initiative.* Paper presented to the annual Canadian Political Science Association meeting, Univeristy of British Columbia.

Burloux, J. (2008). *Un Accord Europeen avec la Societe Civile: Pour un Union Europeenne moins distante*, from www.ecas-citizens.eu, accessed 11/11/2008.

Carmel, E., & Harlock J. (2008). Constituting the third sector as a governable terrain: Partnership, procurement and performance. *Policy and Politics*, *36*(2), 155–171.

Carrington, D. (2002) *The compact – the challenge of implementation.* London: The Home Office.

Casey, J. et al. (2008). *Advocacy in the age of compacts: Regulating government-community sector relations – international experiences* (Working Paper No. 76). Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management (CACOM), University of Technology, Sydney, from http://www.business.uts.edu.au/cacom/publications/WP76.pdf.

Compact Working Group and the Home Office. (2000). *Consultation and policy appraisal: Compact code of good practice.* London, from www.thecompact.org.uk, 11/7/2008.

Compact Working Group and the Home Office. (2001). *Black and minority ethnic voluntary and community organisations: Compact code of good practice.* London, from www.thecompact.org.uk, 11/7/2008.

Compact Working Group and the Home Office. (2003). *Community groups: Compact code of good practice.* London, from www.thecompact.org.uk, 11/7/2008.

Compact Working Group and the Home Office. (2005a). *Funding and procurement: Compact code of good practice.* London, from www.thecompact.org.uk, 11/7/2008.

Compact Working Group and the Home Office. (2005b). *Volunteering: compact code of good practice.* London, from www.thecompact.org.uk, 11/7/2008.

Craig, G., Taylor, M., Bloor, K., & Wilkinson, M. (2002). *Contract or trust: The role of compacts in local governance.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Craig, G., Taylor, M. et al. (2005). *The paradox of compacts: Monitoring the implementation of compacts* (Online Report 02/05). London: Home Office.

Edgar, G. (2008). *Agreeing to disagree: Maintaining dissent in the NGO sector* (Discussion Paper No. 100). Manaku, ACT: The Australia Institute.

Government of Canada. (2001). *An accord between the government of Canada and the voluntary sector*, from www.vsi-isbe/eng/relationship/pdf/the_accord_doc.pdf, 11/11/2008.

Home Office. (1998). *Getting it right together: The compact on relations between government and the voluntary and community sector in England.* London: Home Office.

Institute for Voluntary Action Research. (2008) *Success factors for the implementation of local compacts.* Birmingham: Commission for the Compact.

Kendall, J. (2003). *The voluntary sector.* London: Routledge.

Lewis, J. (2005). New labour's approach to the voluntary sector: Independence and the meaning of partnership. *Social Policy & Society*, *4*(2), 121–131.

Morison, J. (2000). The government-voluntary sector compacts: Governance, governmentality and civil society. *Journal of Law and Society*, *27*(1), 98–132.

NSW Department of Community Services and the Forum of Non-Government Agencies. (2008). *Working together for NSW: An agreement between the NSW government and NSW non-government human services organisations*, from www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/site/govinfo/150.html, 11/11/2008.

Osborne, S., & McLaughlin, K. (2002). Trends and issues in the implementation of 'voluntary sector Compacts' in England. *Public Money and Management,* January-March.

Phillips, S. (2003). In accordance: Canada's voluntary sector accord from idea to implementation. In K. L. Brock (Ed.), *Delicate dances: Public policy and the non-profit sector* (pp. 17–61). Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Plowden, W. (2003). The compact: Attempts to regulate relationships between government and the voluntary sector in England. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 32*(3), 415–432. (See also Commentary by M. Taylor, pp. 432–6.)

Simanowitz, S. (2008). *Dancing to our own tune: The compact – strengthening voluntary sector independence.* London: Compact Voice.

The Scottish Government. (2003). *Scottish compact baseline review*, from openscotland.gov.uk/Publications/2003/08/17485/22802, 10/29/2008.

Voluntary Sector Studies Network (VSSN)

Gareth G. Morgan

Address of Organization

AUA Room B.010
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL
UK
www.vssn.org.uk

Introduction

The Voluntary Sector Studies Network (VSSN) is the principal body linking academic researchers and others interested in the study of the voluntary and third sectors in the United Kingdom. Its membership (133 in 2008) is fundamentally multidisciplinary, comprising sociologists, management scientists, accountants, historians, political scientists and others. Beyond the formal membership, VSSN also operates an e-mail discussion list for questions and debates on research issues – this had 387 participants in 2008.

Brief History

VSSN originated from a seminar series funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), which was hosted at the London School of Economics in the period 1993–1995. On conclusion of the seminar series, participants agreed to form a collegial network, in which members would take turns to host seminars. The first meeting of the network under the VSSN umbrella took place on 6 March 1996 at the University of Manchester.

Mission

The objects of VSSN are for education and research concerning the third sector in the United Kingdom by promoting diffusion of knowledge, publication of research, and networking amongst researchers.

Activities

VSSN's activity is focused on its twice-yearly day seminars, held at various UK universities, typically providing in depth presentations of four or five papers. Jointly with the National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), VSSN also organizes an annual residential "Researching the Voluntary Sector Conference" which is the UK's largest event in third sector research. The conference also includes a major session to support new researchers in the field.

Since 2002 a directory of members' research interests has been published every 2–3 years and from 2004 a website was established. In addition, much activity takes place through the e-mail discussion list.

Structure and Governance

Initially VSSN had no formal organizational structure: finances were handled through the institution hosting the relevant seminar, with contact lists passed on from one organizer to the next. However, by 2002 it was agreed in principle that the network should become formalized and the first VSSN constitution was adopted on 21 May 2003, enabling officers to be appointed and a bank account established.

Professor Peter Halfpenny of the University of Manchester was elected as the first Chair (an office he has held continuously until 2009). In 2006 VSSN became a registered charity, but until 2007 the network continued to be run on an entirely voluntary basis by an elected Steering Group.

Funding

Initially members supported VSSN purely by donations, but subscriptions were introduced in 2006 and from 2007 this enabled the network to appoint a part-time Executive Officer. VSSN remains extremely small in financial terms compared to the scale of its activity: for the year ending 31 July 2008, the total income was just under £10,000 largely from subscriptions and seminar fees (the funds for the annual conference are handled entirely by NCVO so do not appear in the VSSN accounts).

However, in 2008, VSSN won its first external grant to support the development of a UK-based academic journal Voluntary Sector Review: publication is expected to start from 2010.

Accomplishments

VSSN is active in lobbying for the importance of UK research concerning the third sector, and was formally involved in the consultations leading to the ESRC and the UK Government's Office of the Third Sector jointly commissioning a £10 Million Third Sector Research Centre in 2008.

Cross-References

► National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO)

References/Further Readings

Halfpenny, P., Harris, M., & Scott, D. (2005). *History of the Voluntary Sector Studies Network*, from www.vssn.org.uk/about/history.htm.

NCVO & VSSN. (2008). *Researching the Voluntary Sector Conference* (booklet of abstracts). London: NCVO.

VSSN Annual Reports and Accounts. (2003–2008), from www.vsssn.org.uk/about.

Volunteer Management

Lucas Meijs
Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Introduction

Volunteers are important assets of and resources for almost any civil society organization. Volunteers and the volunteer energy they produce must be managed in an efficient and effective way. Good volunteer management not only is beneficial to the services provided, but also for legitimizing the mission of the organization and the long time survival of the civil society itself. As American volunteer management consultant Ellis (1994) explained "To waste a volunteer's time-ever" is one of the deadly sins of managing volunteers. But, as will be shown in this chapter, there is no best way of managing volunteers. Just as with paid- staff organizations a contingency approach is needed taking into account difference in mission, paid staff – volunteer relations and national volunteering cultures. These differences can be translated into two basic approaches to volunteer management. One approach can be characterized as membership management which is volunteer-centered, team-managed, less hierarchical, less structured, and less formalized. The other approach can be characterized as program management which is activity-centered, one manager, more hierarchical, structured, and formalized. Both approached have specific pros and cons (for an elaborated version see Meijs and Ten Hoorn, 2008).

Volunteer Management?

Basically the definitions of volunteer management are similar to the definitions of management in general. In many cases management is based upon clear relations between someone who is the manager and others who are managed, although there is also the concept of self-managed teams. The process of management, whether if is done by an individual or a team, can be divided in a set of activities that need to be performed to make certain that the organizations works. In volunteer management there (sometimes) is a volunteer administrator/manager while the process is build upon steps like (1) Needs Assessment & Program Planning, (2) Job Development & Design, (3) Recruitment, (4) Interviewing & Matching, (5) Orientation & Training, (6) Supervision & Motivation, (7) Recognition, and (8) Evaluation (McCurley & Lynch, 2006, p. 22). This needs to be complemented with more external staff involvement, management support and community involvement. This is the approach that is most common in the literature on volunteer management and administration. Since its emergence in the late 1980 this whole professionalizing of the management of volunteers has helped to move organizations that work with volunteers and the civil society forward. Good organizing and managing of volunteer energy prevents the waste of it (Brudney & Meijs, in print): volunteers become a valuable asset that must be used, instead of "old furniture" that you only keep because sometimes it is convenient. The point that needs to be made is that this approach in its extreme, rigid form is not working in all contexts where volunteering can be found. Although in this article the focus still is on volunteering in an organizational setting, and not just community participation, there are some contingencies that need to be considered. In this article we look at three: the paid staff – volunteer factor, the mission factor and the cultural factor. At the end it leads to a different coloring of the separate steps of the traditional and useful process model.

Another essential part of defining volunteer management is the question where volunteers differ from paid staff. According to Pearce (1993), based upon a research comparing all-volunteer versus all-paid-employee organizations, the organisational behavior of volunteers differs because their relation with the organization displays more role uncertainties. Volunteers are not as easy to "control" as paid workers, because in the end there is no real "hierarchy," sanction or differentiation in reward. Pearce (1993) makes clear that organizational control of volunteers is largely based upon (1) personal relationships, instead of functional, hierarchic relations, (2) engaging volunteers in more rewarding and less demanding tasks and domains, and (3) appeals to shared values. As Paull (2002: 22) states it: "The manager must therefore find a balance between providing guidance and organizing the work so that the organizational outcomes are achieved, and treating the volunteer in a manner appropriate to their volunteer status." From a management perspective it serves better to assume that volunteers all "use" their activities to their own advantage (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991). But, if a volunteer manager can make use of the three elements of organizational control and can prevent demotivation, volunteers can be a powerful and trustful part of the nonprofit workforce.

Key Issues: A Contingency Approach

The Paid Staff-Volunteer Factor

A first distinction is based upon the relation between paid staff and volunteers. On the one extreme of the continuum there are organizations were the only volunteers are the board members. Although these volunteers also need to be recruited, trained, supported, and guided, they are not considered to be the goal of volunteer management. On the other side of the continuum the (small) all-volunteer organization without a connection to paid staff can be found. In these organizations there is a big need for leadership and organizing capacity but a lot of resistance to the big word "management." In between we can find grassroots organizations/volunteer-run (dominated by volunteers) and volunteer-supported organizations (dominated by paid staff). In these two types, volunteer management plays a role.

Smith (2000: 80) distinguishes two kinds of **grassroots associations**, monomorphic, and polymorphic organizations. Monomorphic grassroots are not vertically affiliated with an (other) organization. This kind of organization is autonomous, but can be tied to a foundation or government agency. Polymorphic organizations are part of a national organization resulting in limitations on decision-making because there is some centralized governance and management. According to Smith (2000: 13) "Grassroots associations (GA) tend not to be interested in the nonprofit management profession, the volunteer administration profession, or complicated GA (grassroots associations) leadership tactics" although also grassroots have "management" systems based upon sociability, purposive, service, informational, developmental, utilitarian, charismatic, lobbying, and prestige incentives (2000: 95–102). But management in essence must be less hierarchical and less formal because, volunteer/run organizations will come to a halt when volunteers stop and leave the organization.

In *volunteer-supported organizations* paid staff performs the primary processes and a volunteer administrator runs a (kind of "separate") volunteer program. Volunteers are used to carry out specific tasks. This is the classical organizational setting for the volunteer administrator. Volunteer-supported organizations will continue to operate even when there are no volunteers present. In this case the quality of service may become less, but the organizations themselves will not be in danger. This makes possible a more demanding approach to managing volunteers. In these organizations, the metaphor of the workplace is and can, in many cases, be used (Liao-Troth, 2005).

The Mission Factor

According to Handy (1988) organizational practice differs between three basic types of voluntary organizations: "service delivery," "campaigning," and "mutual support." *Service delivery organizations* aim to provide a "good" service to an actual customer or client outside the organization. As a consequence volunteers are prepared to submit to be selected (refused) and being managed (told what to do). In service-delivery organizations it seems logical to develop a volunteer management model based upon the workplace metaphor (see Carroll & Harris, 1999). The basic volunteer management processes as described by Brudney (1990), Ellis (1996) and McCurley and Lynch (2006) are predominantly oriented to this type of organization, especially when they are paid-staff dominated. Selection of volunteers depends on their perceived competence to perform the job. The *campaigning organization*, or advocacy/social movement organization aims to convince or take on the entire world. Selecting new volunteers is based upon testing their true "believe" in the good cause instead of their capabilities per se. Management in a campaigning context is double faced. The process of protesting itself is mostly well planned and organized to be open for all kind of volunteers (the more the better). Organizing is the word. But, the process of formulating the "opinion" is less structured and limited to only core volunteers. Management seems not to be the issue here, it is much more "democracy" or "leadership."

There is also the issue that the work itself in campaigning organizations is less structured than that of a service-delivery organization. In campaigning organizations, the work never stops and it sometimes becomes an integral part of a volunteer's life (Carroll & Harris, 1999: 14). The workplace model simply does not work (Carroll & Harris, 1999: 16). The recommendation is to proceed from the enthusiasm and commitment that exists among the volunteers trying not to "kill" that by too much management. The *mutual support organization* exists because a group of people come together around an issue that binds them: an illness, sport, or shared interest. Mutual support organizations are, in many cases, grass roots organizations. As most grassroots organizations, mutual support organizations tend toward informal organization and more internal democracy, are more likely to be a "member benefit group" than a "nonmember benefit group," are often polymorphic, have substantial sociodemographic homogeneity and have few economic resources (Smith, 2000: 107–123). Solidarity and camaraderie are the most important qualities. There is very limited acceptance for a manager, unless the "hierarchy" is based upon authority earned by being the best soccer player or having collected the most stamps. There is almost always a clear personal relationship between volunteers and members (clients) in mutual support organizations. Within mutual support organizations members work together to organize all. The foremost important selection criterion for a volunteer is being a member and a sense of belonging. In theory, this should make volunteer recruitment easier because the potential volunteers are all known to the organization. But being limited to only members also creates a potential misfit between organizational capabilities and ambitions (Hoogendam & Meijs, 1998) because what the organization can achieve is limited by the competencies of the members/volunteers. Therefore, mutual support organizations can be weak if they lack enough resources and diversity in their membership, but they are strong if resources are available and the culture is strong. They are indestructible like weeds if they form a group of "last-heroes" who decide that they will survive.

The Cultural Factor

Based upon an analysis of the words for volunteering in different countries Dekker (2002) differentiates between unpaid work, active membership and active citizenship as three approaches to volunteering. This is backed up by research into cross-national perceptions of volunteering suggesting that individuals in different countries do not consider the same activities to be volunteer work (Handy et al., 2000). In the setting of unpaid labor management can be quite similar to the (hierarchical) management of the workplace. In an active membership context management is much more about involving "peers" in your organization and agenda. Management becomes less hierarchical and much more a team effort. In the environment of the active citizen the impression is that management is even more complicated if the active citizen perceives itself as an independent and autonomous person who, especially in volunteering, acts totally out of his/her free will.

Different Styles of Volunteer Management

The previous paragraphs have made clear that volunteer management is not the same in all organizations and organizational contexts. In the following we will present two different styles of volunteer management and compare them on issues of (1) Needs Assessment & Program Planning, (2) Job Development & Design, (3) Recruitment, (4) Interviewing & Matching, (5) Orientation & Training, (6) Supervision & Motivation, (7) Recognition, and (8) Evaluation (McCurley & Lynch, 2006: 22).

Of course several authors have addressed the need for a more diverse conceptualization of volunteer management. Rochester (1999: 9–15) observes that "many voluntary agencies have adopted a bureaucratic approach to the organization of volunteering" but that this "one size" workplace model does not fit all organizations, especially what he calls "member/activist" and "coworker" organizations (1999:15). Next Rochester gives four models of volunteer involvement in small voluntary organizations: service delivery, support role, member/activist, and coworker. In the service-delivery model volunteers do the operational work in, again, a workplace metaphor. In the support role the volunteers do perform less primary and crucial activities. The general idea is that volunteers can be managed less strict in this model. In the membership/activist model volunteers perform all roles, functions, and activities. These seem to be constantly renegotiable. Training is not connected to the needs of the job but much more to personal needs of the volunteers. In the coworker model there are almost no differences between paid staff and volunteers. Seen from the management perspective this is quit similar to the membership/activist model.

Meijs and Hoogstad (2001) (see also Meijs & Karr, 2004) have developed two styles of management of volunteers. In their typology, management systems most often focus either on the volunteers themselves (membership management) or on specific operational tasks (program management). Membership management starts with the possibilities and needs of the volunteers. The idea of membership management is to start with the preferences of the volunteers by asking each member what he or she wants to do. The decision on what is done and by who is made by the people themselves. As can be understood this means that the distance between the management, if there is a management at all, and the volunteers is small. In many organizations there will be very strong personal links (e.g., they are all related). This of course leads to a strong organizational culture with shared norms and values which are very important to establish organizational control (Pearce, 1993). On the other hand, maintaining quality in the eyes of external clients is difficult because the volunteer motivation is highly socially oriented, and volunteer status is internally oriented and decided. This typically is not a management system in which expectations of volunteers are explicitly formulated or where volunteers are "fired" if they do not perform. Recognition comes from peers, not from external forces.

Looking from the perspective of organizational change and adaptation membership managed organizations are difficult to change but also need less to adapt, because as long as some volunteers feel they like each other and like what they are doing the organization will exist! According to Meijs and Karr (2004: 178) the strong point of membership management is its capability "of generating broad, multifaceted involvement of volunteers, leading perhaps to a greater overall satisfaction with the volunteer experience."

Program management, which is much like the workplace model of volunteer management, starts with needs assessment and specifying tasks for volunteers to do. Because tasks and activities are the central point it becomes easy to dispose of volunteers which do not function or need to change their working habits because the organization needs to adapt to changing circumstances. Program management in this way creates specific, time-limited tasks that a volunteer can perform without problems and in many cases without any other volunteer. On the other hand, program management probably will not develop loyalty on the part of volunteers (see Meijs & Hoogstad, 2001).

Future Directions: The Link Between Management Styles and Organizational Context

Basically there seem to be two different volunteer management styles (See Table 1). The first **formal** style (traditional process approach, program management, workplace model) has a more rigid management based upon hierarchy and a clear volunteer manager. The second **informal** style (grass roots, membership management, coworker model) is less based upon formal hierarchy and the position of a volunteer manager.

Volunteer Management. Table 1 Two Volunteer Management Styles

	• Service delivery	• Mutual support
	• Campaigning (protesting)	
	• Volunteer supported	• Campaigning (formulate mission)
	• Unpaid labor	• Volunteer-run
		• Active membership
		• Active citizenship
	Rigid/formal	**Non rigid/informal**
Needs assessment & program planning	Research into the needs of the community and what other organizations are (not) doing	Sitting around the table with a group of willing volunteers and discuss what they want to do
Job development & design	Organizational design to create a structure and job descriptions that can be done by anyone	Starting with the competencies of volunteers jobs are created that a specific volunteer can do and these are combined into some kind of (temporary) structure
Recruitment	A broad appeal on the whole community	If needed an appeal on close friends and relatives will be made
Interviewing & matching	Finding out if the people who have reacted on the broad appeal have the competencies and availability to perform the assigned tasks	Almost no need for because people that are recruited will get something to do
Orientation & training	Based upon solving the deficiencies volunteers may have to perform the tasks	Based upon what volunteers want to learn; this can be nothing, what is needed for the job or (totally) unrelated
Supervision & motivation	Done by one manager and based upon achievement	Done by the group and based upon fitting in
Recognition	Concrete achievement	Long acceptance within group
Evaluation	How do clients feel?	How do volunteers feel?

Formal volunteer management is probably better suited for most paid-staff dominated nonprofits, especially if these are service deliveries. Also for most volunteer-run service-delivery organizations a more formal management approach is advisable. Moving to campaigning organizations the picture becomes blurry. For the process of making decisions on the mission (in many cases done by a limited elite who sets strict but "unclear" selection criteria) most organizations probably want to use more informal approaches, while for realization (the actual protesting) sometime more rigid management approaches are used to ascertain that as many people as possible can participate. Especially if the intention is to have episodic participation of citizens good organizing becomes important. Next of course are mutual support organizations. It must be clear that in these organizations informal management systems should be used because the basic idea of sharing a common feature blocks the idea of someone being a hierarchical manager. Also we can probably safely say that the more a organizations is run by volunteers (and less by paid staff), the more informal management should become.

Looking at emotions and cultures on volunteering it seems obvious that perceiving volunteering as unpaid labor opens the door for more rigid management approaches, while active citizenship and naturally active membership ask for much more informal and less rigid management.

The next step is to link the both the rigid/formal and the non rigid/informal approaches to the eight steps in the traditional process approach of McCurley and Lynch (2006).

The art of volunteer management is adapting general management knowledge and skills into an environment in which there is by definition less hierarchy, less control and less possibility of (differentiating in) reward and punishment. Second to that, there are certain volunteer involving organizations in which the idea that volunteers are "just" unpaid workers and they should be managed they same way as in the general workplace should be abolished. In these organizational contexts a much more informal, people oriented way of management is needed. Much alike the new management styles that are being developed to run professional firms.

Cross-References

- ► Grassroots Associations
- ► Nonprofit Management
- ► Volunteers
- ► Work and Employment in the Nonprofit Sector

References/Further Readings

Brudney, J. L. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector, planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities.* San Francisco, CA/Oxford: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. L., & Meijs, L. C. P. M. (in print). It ain't natural: toward a new (natural) resource conceptualization for volunteer management. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly.*

Carroll, M., & Harris, M. (1999). Voluntary action in a campaigning context: An exploratory study of greenpeace. *Voluntary Action, 2*(1), 9–18.

Cnaan, R., & Goldberg-Glen, R. S. (1991). Measuring motivation to volunteer in human services. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 27,* 269–284.

Dekker, P. (2002). On the prospects of volunteering in civil society. *Voluntary Action, 2*(1), 31–48.

Ellis, S. J. (1994). The seven deadly sins of directing volunteers. *The Non Profit Times*, November.

Ellis, S. J. (1996). *From the top down; the executive role in volunteer program success* (Rev. ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Energize Associates.

Handy, C. (1988). *Understanding voluntary organizations, how to make them function effectively* (p. 180). London: Penguin.

Handy, F., Cnaan, Ram, A.,. Brudney, J. L. Ascoli, U., Meijs, L. C. P. M., and Ranade, S. (2000). Public perception of "Who is a volunteer?": An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross- cultural perspective. In Voluntas, *International Journal of voluntary and Nonprofit organizations. 11*(1), 45–65.

Hoogendam, A. C. J., & Meijs, L. C. P. M. (1998). *Vrijwilligers in de sportvereniging: organiseren van betrokkenheid. [Volunteers in sport associations: Organizing commitment.]* (p. 64). NOV: Utrecht.

Liao-Troth, M. A. (2005). Are they here for the long haul? The effects of functional motives and personality factors on the psychological contracts of volunteers. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 34,* 510–530.

McCurley, S., & Lynch, R. (2006). *Volunteer management: Mobilizing all the resources of the community* (2nd ed., p. 269). Johnstone Training and Consultation, from http://www.energizeinc.com/store/5-224-E-1

Meijs, L. C. P. M., & Hoogstad, E. (2001). New ways of managing volunteers: Combining membership management and program management. *Voluntary action, 3*(3), 41–61.

Meijs, L. C. P. M., & Karr, L. B. (2004). Managing volunteers in different settings: Membership and program management. In R. A. Stebbins & M. Grahem. (Eds.), *Volunteering as leisure/leisure as volunteering* (pp. 177–193). Oxfordshire: CABI.

Meijs, L. C. P. M. & Ten Hoorn, E. M. (2008). No One best Volunteer Administrator. In Liao-Troth, M. (Ed.) *Challenges in Volunteer Management. A Volume in Research in Public Management* (pp 29–50). Information Age Publishing Inc.

Paull, M. (2002). Reframing volunteer management. A view from the West. *Australian Journal on Volunteering, 7*(1), 21–27.

Pearce, J. L. (1993). *Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers* (p. 223). London: Routledge.

Rochester, C. (1999). One size does not fit all. Four models of involving volunteers in voluntary organizations. *Voluntary Action, 1*(2), 7–20.

Smith, D. H. (2000). *Grassroots Associations* (p. 342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Volunteers

Jeffrey L. Brudney
Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH, USA

Introduction

Volunteers are a cornerstone of research and practice in civil society and in the nonprofit sector more generally. Although consensus has yet to emerge on the meaning of "civil society" (e.g., Anheier & Salmon, 2006: 90–92) the construct can be generally understood as the realm of citizens' organizations and civic engagement, i.e., as "collective citizen action, outside the confines of the family, market, and state" (Heinrich, 2007: xxi). The CIVICUS *Global Survey of the State of Civil Society* includes in its definition of civil society activities such as volunteering and participation in organizations, social movements, faith-based organizations, groups, clubs, community associations, and the like (Heinrich, 2007: xxi–xxvii). Virginia A. Hodgkinson (2003: 35–36) is more expansive in identifying civil society as the "public space…between government and the market where citizens could debate ideas, serve various causes, research, engage in political and social action, advocate, and or protest, sing in choirs, associate in diverse kinds of organizations, serve others in need, educate, recreate, and generally participate and contribute to the life of their communities." Given these broad conceptualizations of civil society, volunteers, and volunteerism – the topic of this chapter – must play a prominent role.

In a review article on "Voluntarism" published in the *International Encyclopedia of Public Policy and Administration* scarcely a decade ago, Jeffrey L. Brudney (1998) lamented that little firm knowledge seemed to exist on the topic cross-nationally, and urged the need for more international research on volunteering. Although much more remains to be discovered and learned in this arena, the comparative study of volunteerism is "now flourishing"

(Musick & Wilson, 2008: 368), with new international surveys and literature. This chapter takes advantage of the international interest and research to discuss volunteers in civil society. It addresses four basic questions in this core domain: (1) Definition: Who is a volunteer? (2) International perspectives: How much volunteering occurs? (3) Key issues: What factors affect volunteering in civil society? (4) Future directions: What are some of the major research questions awaiting further inquiry on volunteers and volunteering in civil society? Before turning to those questions, the chapter briefly considers the historical context of this essay.

Definition

Despite the roots of civil society, civic engagement, and the nonprofit sector in voluntary activity, the meaning and use of the term "volunteer" is not uniform across researchers, participants, or the public. As Ram A. Cnaan et al. (1996: 365) observe, "Although researchers currently use the term volunteer across a wide range of settings to denote nonsalaried service, the term has no clear and coherent definition." In their comprehensive volume, *Volunteers: A Social Profile*, Marc A. Musick and John Wilson (2008) devote an entire chapter to defining volunteers and volunteering, distinguishing these terms from related concepts such as membership, social activism, and caring. They conclude, "Deciding what should count as volunteer work turns out to be much more difficult than it might at first appear" (p. 25). The lack of consensus regarding meaning and use confounds even the most basic scientific activities to measure, classify, and compare volunteering across different studies, contexts, and countries. Although work is underway to clarify the international context – the Center for Civil Society Studies at Johns Hopkins University (2007) is involved in a major effort with the International Labour Organization and the United Nations to reconcile and standardize data collection and reporting on volunteers cross-nationally through measuring volunteer work in official national labor force surveys throughout the world – confusion persists. That confusion spills over to respondents in survey research, who while providing answers to questions asking if they volunteer, must wonder what the term encompasses, and whether their activity falls under the definition. Meijs et al. (2003: 19) remark, "People presented with seemingly similar examples of volunteering perceive them differently as volunteering, for unknown reasons. The same people may perceive volunteer activities differently depending on their own context or reference. Especially for international comparative studies, a better understanding of the definition and even more important perception of volunteering is needed" (compare Musick & Wilson, 2008: 25).

Based on a comprehensive review of definitions of volunteer found in the literature, Cnaan and Laura Amrofell (1994) identified ten facets of volunteering: who is the volunteer, what is being volunteered, the level of formality versus informality of the volunteer work, the frequency of volunteering, the amount of time devoted to each volunteer episode, the relationship of the volunteer to the beneficiaries of the activity, the characteristics of those beneficiaries, who manages the volunteers, volunteer management activities, and rewards to the volunteer. Using a mapping sentence approach, Cnaan and Amrofell (1994: 349) insist that to understand and compare findings of studies on "volunteers" correctly, the ten facets (the full sentence) must be explicated: "It is our contention that only the combination of all facets forms a volunteer profile that is distinctive enough to warrant generalizations."

Cnaan et al. (1996) found that all definitions of volunteer can be distilled into four common dimensions, and that these dimensions establish a criterion for assessing and comparing all definitions and situations of who is a volunteer. Based on a review of more than 300 articles and reports, these dimensions (and their gradations) consist of: the degree of voluntariness of the activity (from free will, to relatively uncoerced, to obligation to volunteer); the nature of the reward received by the volunteer (none, none expected, expenses reimbursed, stipend/low pay); the context or auspices or structure in which the volunteer activity takes place (formal, i.e., in an organizational setting, versus informal); and the beneficiaries of the voluntary activity (from an act that benefits/helps other people or strangers, to one that benefits/helps friends or relatives, to one that benefits the volunteer as well as other people). Cnaan et al. (1996) maintain that all definitions of volunteer can be subsumed under these four dimensions, with the definitions of volunteer ranging from the most restrictive or "pure" (characterized by free will, no reward to the volunteer, undertaken in a formal structure, with other people/strangers as beneficiaries) to the most inclusive or "broad" (characterized by an obligation to volunteer, stipend/low pay to the volunteer, undertaken informally, with the volunteer as a beneficiary), and "moderate" or mixed conceptions falling in-between.

Although no single conception of volunteer can be considered "the" correct one, how the public (and researchers) define and measure the term has implications for public policy, academic studies, and cross-national comparison. Cnaan et al. (1996) propose that the public at large defines volunteering according to the more restrictive definitions, and conclude that people who incur a high "net cost" in volunteering (broadly defined as the costs minus the benefits to the volunteer) are likely to be viewed as a more of a volunteer than someone whose net cost is low. Costs to the volunteer include such items as the time spent volunteering, effort, and income and social pleasures forgone. Benefits include not only tangible (monetary) benefits but also enhanced social status and opportunities, the probability of future tangible rewards such as business contacts, work experience, and skills acquisition (p. 373). The researchers examined this characterization of perceptions of volunteering based on a sample of 514 respondents in the United States (in the states of Pennsylvania and Delaware) and found that the concept of net cost best accounted for the judgments of who is considered a volunteer (p. 375). The higher the net cost and the "purer" the volunteer act, the higher the person was ranked as a volunteer (p. 381).

Building on this research, Handy et al. (2000) and Meijs et al. (2003) show that the net-cost conception of volunteering holds internationally. They find that the more altruistic the activity, the higher the net cost, and the more likely the person is to be perceived as a volunteer by the public. In a cross-national study based on data from large samples (450 adults or more) in Canada, India, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United States (in the states of Georgia and Philadelphia), "The data strongly support the theory of net cost in explaining public perceptions of who is 'more' a volunteer…[T]he data show that the higher the perceived net cost to the volunteer of a certain volunteer activity the higher the individual is ranked as a volunteer" (p. 64). This trend is prevalent in each of the cultures examined: Across all four dimensions of volunteering identified by Cnaan et al. (1996), the more altruistic the person, the higher the net cost and the more likely the person is to be perceived as a volunteer.

Although no uniform or "standard" definition of volunteer fits all contexts and circumstances, this research demonstrates that volunteering can be understood along four dimensions: voluntariness of the activity, the nature of the reward received by the volunteer, the auspices or structure in which the volunteer activity takes place, and the beneficiaries of the voluntary activity. These four dimensions offer a continuum from the most pure or restricted conception of volunteering to the most broad and encompassing. The implication is that it is not the activity itself that undergirds popular conceptions and definitions of who is a volunteer or what is volunteering, but the context of the activity. In general, based on evidence across several nations, the more restrictive the conception, the more likely the public is to regard those instances as volunteering. Musick and Wilson (2008: 26) concur that "what is normally considered volunteer work is formal, public, and unpaid." Survey research, which undergirds much of the knowledge of volunteering – and virtually all of its measurement – is likely to reflect this perspective (Hodgkinson, 2003).

Historical Background

This chapter aims to contribute to the knowledge of volunteerism in civil society based on the results of the rich empirical inquiry that has been undertaken on the topic. Although volunteers and volunteering have a long history in civil society, very little systematic empirical information on volunteerism exists dating back more than two decades, especially from an international perspective. Even in the United States, where empirical research on volunteerism has the longest legacy, data pertaining to volunteering are rare prior to the last decade of the twentieth century. An empirically-based "history" of volunteer involvement in civil society cross-nationally would more likely tap mounting interest in this phenomenon and sophistication in its measurement than any reliable trends or developments. Systematic empirical research on volunteerism is growing across the globe. This chapter draws on this emerging body of knowledge to synthesize and present vital information regarding volunteers and volunteering in civil society.

Key Issues

What factors affect volunteering in civil society? This key issue has long attracted the attention of students of volunteerism. Several scholars have prepared insightful reviews attempting to summarize the voluminous literature devoted to explaining who volunteers and the factors that affect this behavior (Wymer et al, 1996; Smith, 1994; Berger, 1991). Gazley and Dignam (2008) offer a very recent review, focused primarily on volunteering in the United States.

Based on a 1990 national survey of giving and volunteering behavior in the United States, Berger (1991) concluded that the strongest factor leading one to volunteer is to have been the target of recruitment efforts, a finding corroborated in many other surveys (e.g., Independent Sector, 2002; Kirsch et al., 2000). From an analysis of a pooled data-set compiled from a series of surveys on giving and volunteering in the United States undertaken by the Independent Sector in the 1990s (1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1999), Musick and Wilson (2008: 290) find, "Regardless of socio-demographic differences and differences in church attendance, people were more likely to volunteer if they were asked. Only 15% of those who had not been recruited last year had done any volunteer work during that time, compared to three-quarters of those who had been." Moreover, people who have been recruited contribute many more hours; the ratio of volunteers to hours donated among those recruited is five times higher than for people who have not been recruited.

Berger finds that making philanthropic contributions is closely associated with volunteering to organizations, although the direction of the relationship (does donating time lead to donating money, or the reverse?) and the source (are giving time and money the product of some other factor, such as family upbringing?) are unclear. The level of formal education attained is the individual characteristic with the strongest impact on volunteering. In cross-national studies, too, the more education people have, the more likely they are to volunteer (Musick & Wilson, 2008: 365). Smith (1994) concurs with these findings, and identifies other variables important to volunteering, such as higher socioeconomic status and participation in other forms of social activity. Frequent churchgoers are more likely to volunteer than those who never go to church; "in virtually all countries for which there are reliable data, frequency of church attendance is positively related to volunteering" (Musick & Wilson, 2008: 359).

In the United States, Gazley and Dignam (2008: 7) observe that "the demographic profile of the American volunteer is fairly stable," with women volunteering slightly more than men, married people substantially more than those who are single, parents with children under age 18 more than those without, and employed people more than the unemployed (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). Cross-nationally, employed people are more likely to volunteer than those not in the labor force. However, women are less likely to be involved in volunteering, especially in more traditional cultures and societies (Musick & Wilson, 2008: 365–366).

Age bears a more complicated relationship to volunteering in the United States, Gazley and Dignam (2008: 8) describe it as an "s-curve": Teenagers are more likely to volunteer than adults in their twenties, but individuals aged 35–44 are most likely to volunteer, followed by older age groups (p. 8). In general, with the exception of teenagers, individuals are more likely to volunteer at midlife than at younger or older ages. Cross-nationally, age manifests highly contingent effects on the rate of volunteering according to the individual country (Musick & Wilson, 2008: 367–368). Finally, socioeconomic status and education are the strongest predictors of formal volunteering to an organization, although less so for informal volunteering in the United States. "Volunteerism is also strongly linked to other kinds of civic engagement. Volunteers are more likely to vote, engage in political organizing, and make charitable gifts when compared to non-volunteers" (Gazley & Dignam, 2008: 7; Wing et al., 2008).

All of the research reviews agree on the complexity of volunteer behavior and offer explanatory frameworks encompassing multiple dimensions and many variables. Smith (1994) establishes that a complete explanation of volunteering must take into account the context or environment of the individual (for example, size of community); her or his social background (for example, gender); personality (for example, sense of efficacy); attitudes (for example, liking volunteer work); situation (for example, receiving services from the organization); and social participation (for example, neighborhood interaction). Similarly, Wymer et al. (1996) propose a model of the "Determinants of Volunteerism" which includes variables related to: the person (personality, values, attitudes), social interactions (previous, current, anticipated), efficacy (skill utilization, skill development), and context (time, money, psychological). In their book Musick and Wilson (2008) elaborate a more exhaustive inventory of explanatory factors (chapters) encompassing: subjective dispositions (personality; motives; values, norms, and attitudes); individual resources (socioeconomic resources, time and health, gender, race); and the social context of volunteering (life course: early stages; life course: later stages; social resources; volunteer recruitment; schools and congregations; community, neighborhood, city, and region).

Adding to this complexity are country- or national-level differences in volunteering. "Volunteer characteristics vary considerably from country to country, along with the extent of research efforts to understand voluntary activity" (Gazley & Dignam, 2008: 6–7). Citing research by the Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies noted above, Hodgkinson (2003: 39–41) summarizes, "One can theorize that the wide variation in volunteer rates has to do with culture, national history, religious background, or economic situation, but the data are uneven. The volunteer rates of various nations cannot be fully explained by any one of these variables with much consistency. . . . Across nations, however, there is no single predictor of volunteering that stands out."

Musick and Wilson (2008: 342–369) make clear that a full explanation of volunteering from the international perspective must embrace both national-level variations in volunteering, i.e., structural features such as type of government, size of the welfare state, income, class structure, and size of the nonprofit sector, and individual-level variations (variables) or "correlates" pertaining to the people living in those countries. Based on the 1999–2001 World Values Survey data, they classify volunteering into three clusters, service, advocacy, and religious, and use appropriate multilevel modeling techniques to estimate the effects of both country- and individual-level variables on participation in the different types.

The results of the Musick-Wislson (2008: 364–365) multilevel analysis show that service volunteers were more likely to be male, single, working part-time, highly educated, affluent, and frequent churchgoers. They explain that this international portrait of the typical volunteer differs from that of the American volunteer (described by Gazley & Digan, 2008) in being male and single (perhaps because youth and sports volunteering are included in the classification of service volunteering). Advocacy volunteers were more likely to be male, middle aged, employed, well educated, affluent, and frequent churchgoers. This profile is quite similar to the American volunteer with the exception of being male rather than female, probably a consequence of the inclusion of work-related associations in the advocacy category. Finally, religious volunteers tended to be older, married, better educated, paid higher salaries, part-time workers, and frequent churchgoers. This profile is also quite similar to that of the American volunteer, with the exception that the WVS religious volunteer is no more likely to be male than female. In sum, Musick and Wilson (2008: 365) find that the socioeconomic profile of the volunteer in different countries is quite similar – with the exception of the effect of gender – but that the mix of volunteer activities across countries leads to some differences in who volunteers.

International Perspectives

Volunteering is a significant social – and economic – force in civil society across nations. In the United States, the first nationally representative study of volunteer involvement in nonprofit organizations determined that four out of five public charities with $25,000 in annual gross receipts utilized volunteers (Urban Institute, 2004). Hundreds of thousands more nonprofit groups and associations with fewer budgetary resources, including the legions of all volunteer organizations, enlist volunteers. One in three religious congregations in the United States manages volunteers in social service outreach programs (Urban Institute, 2004). According to surveys conducted by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Corporation for National and Community Service, in the United States about 6.5% of the population volunteers on an average day, or more than 15 million volunteers per day in 2006. They donated about 12.9 billion hours in 2006, the equivalent of 7.6 million full-time employees. Were these volunteers compensated monetarily at the average private nonfarm hourly wage rate, the equivalent dollar value of their contribution would reach a staggering $215.6 billion (Wing et al., 2008: 70; US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008; compare Independent Sector, 2001).

Evidence has begun to accumulate cross-nationally regarding the scope of volunteering. Very recently, the capability to capture this type of information has improved across the globe. Meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, in December 2008, the eighteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians representing a cross-section of the world's official statistical agencies adopted standard guidelines developed by the Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies to measure the amount and characteristics of the work of volunteers using labor force and other household surveys in every country.

Researchers at the Johns Hopkins University Center have taken an active role in defining and measuring "Global Civil Society" (Salamon et al., 2003). Using a common research methodology applied across eight highly diverse countries and cultures (Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, France, Japan, New Zealand, and the United States), these researchers establish that nonprofit institutions are a "significant economic force" (Salamon et al., 2007: 4). Including the value added by volunteers, these institutions account for an average of 5% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the eight countries for which comparable data are available (p. 4). Even when estimated conservatively, volunteer time accounts for more than a quarter of the contribution of nonprofit institutions to GDP (seven-country average) compared to other factors (i.e., employee compensation, consumption of fixed capital, net taxes on production, and operating surplus) (p. 9). Of the sources of nonprofit revenue from philanthropy, moreover, gifts of time surpass gifts of money by a ratio of almost 1.5: 1, and in some countries by ratio of 3:1 (seven-country average, p. 10).

In earlier research Salamon and Sokolowski (2001, 2003) examined volunteering in 24 countries across 12 different areas of nonprofit activity (culture; education and research; health; social services; environment; development; civic and advocacy; philanthropy; international; religious congregations; business, professional, and unions; and "other"). They found that the volunteer work contributed to these organizations is equivalent to 11 million full-time-equivalent (FTE) jobs (p. 3). In a larger study of 35 nations, researchers found that over 40% of full-time equivalent nonprofit jobs were volunteers, the equivalent of

16.8 million full-time workers (Anheier & Salamon, 2006, 98). As in the more recent Center for Civil Society Studies report described above (Salamon et al., 2007), volunteer work was shown to provide a much greater share of private philanthropy than money, on average exceeding private monetary donations by a ratio of 2:1. The authors conclude, "Therefore, volunteering adds an important dimension to the picture of the nonprofit sector drawn by economic indicators – it gives social salience to nonprofit operations. It stands to reason that a relatively high volume of volunteer input contributed to nonprofit entities reflects a relatively high level of importance attributed to the work of these entities by society at large" (p. 4).

Expressed as a proportion of total nonagricultural employment to control for differences in the size of national economies, the volume of volunteer activity across the 24 countries ranged from a low of 0.2% of nonagricultural employment in Mexico to a high of 8.0% in Sweden; the average across the 24 countries was 2.5% (Salamon & Sokolowski, 2001, 2003). With respect to fields of volunteer activity, social services and culture and recreation combined absorbed nearly 60% of all volunteer input in the 23 countries with available data. The remaining 40% of volunteer effort was distributed among eight fields, most prominently, health, community, and economic development, education, unions, and professional associations, and civic and advocacy activity. Although most volunteer input concentrates in the areas of social services and culture and recreation, substantial differences arise among countries in the distribution of this activity. In sum, not only does the amount of volunteer activity vary substantially cross-nationally, but also so does its composition (Salamon & Sokolowski, 2001, 2003; Anheier & Salamon, 2006).

Using different sources of data Hodgkinson (2003) has also explored "Volunteering in Global Perspective." Based on data from the European Values Surveys (EVS) and the World Values Surveys (WVS), which built upon the EVS, she presents results on volunteering from those 47 countries whose data collection had been completed in the 1999–2002 EVS/WVS surveys (p. 37).

The findings from Hodgkinson's (2003) analysis show enormous, and sometimes anomalous, variation in the rate of reported volunteering by global region and nation (see also Musick & Wilson, 2008: 343). Helmut K. Anheier and Lester M. Salamon (2006: 98) caution, "Systematic information and knowledge about volunteering in non-Western countries is still sketchy." As expected, the United States, long known for its history as a nation of "joiners" and volunteers (Ellis & Campbell, 2005), has an impressive reported volunteer rate of two-thirds (66%) of its adult population. Yet, China recorded the highest rate of any country in the 1999–2002 EVS/WVS surveys, with over three-fourths (77%) of the adult population classified as "volunteers"; Hodgkinson (2003, 39) explains, "but this is because the population is expected to volunteer by the government." Similarly, in some Eastern European countries and Russia, where the transition to democracy has been difficult, volunteer rates were much lower, 7% in Russia (the lowest rate of any of the 47 countries and the only one in single digits) and 10% in Serbia, perhaps because "volunteering is associated with required volunteering under communism" (p. 39). Hodgkinson (2003) also finds great variation across countries with respect to the fields in which volunteers are involved, social welfare, religion, environment, and sports, a finding echoed by Musick and Wilson (2008; see below).

In sum, volunteering is a significant social and economic force cross-nationally. By the end of the twentieth century a trend toward the "globalization of volunteering" was evident, acknowledged by the United Nations in a resolution declaring 2001 the "International Year of Volunteers" (Musick & Wilson, 2008: 533). Although the trend may be sweeping, based on the studies undertaken, the explanation of volunteering cross-nationally, and even within a single country, is expected to be complex and contingent.

Future Directions

This chapter has provided crucial background information on volunteers and volunteering in civil society. It has addressed the topics of definition, international perspectives, and key issues. The chapter concludes by proposing major research questions awaiting further inquiry on volunteers and volunteering in civil society.

A first question concerns the characteristics of the voluntary activity itself. Considerable literature and commentary suggest sharp growth in "episodic volunteers," a substantial group whose psychological and time commitment to any one organization is highly tenuous (Macduff, 2005; Hustinx & Lammertyn, 2003; Brudney & Gazley, 2006; Fixler, Eichberg & Lorenz, 2008). Although the traditional conception of service volunteering, especially in the United States, depicts participants contributing time to an organization on a fairly regular, ongoing basis, episodic volunteers may donate time just once or sporadically or perhaps for a short period or specific project. In the US episodic volunteers may account for as much as 40% or more of volunteers (Kirsch et al., 2000: 5). Steve McCurley and Susan Ellis (2003: 1) conclude, "You can find similar data in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and practically every other country that's done even a casual survey of volunteer attitudes."

The roots of episodic volunteering warrant further study. Equally important is the question of how episodic volunteering affects programs, organizations, missions, and causes that depend on sustained volunteer labor. How will host organizations and groups adapt to an apparently large and growing number of volunteers who prefer to give their time in a manner that although consistent with their own attitudes and motivations may be less helpful to the needs and interests of organizations for continuing involvement?

This concern with the role of the organization in regard to (episodic) volunteering raises a second issue: What part does volunteer management play in stimulating, maintaining, and enhancing volunteer engagement? Research is needed on such questions as, how do nonprofit and voluntary organizations, businesses, and corporations with employee-based and other volunteer programs, and even government organizations – which enlist perhaps one-quarter of all volunteer activity in the United States (Brudney, 1990) – affect who volunteers, how much they volunteer, the effects of the contribution of time for the individual and the organization and its voluntary mission, and the prospects for future volunteering. To take but one example, the Corporation for National and Community Service (2007) in the United States reports that one in three Americans dropped out of volunteering between 2005 and 2006, and McCurley and Lynch (2005) document challenges in retaining volunteers cross-nationally. At least some of the blame for the fall-off must be placed at the door of host organizations and their volunteer programs and managers. Related questions concern whether different types of volunteer programs, for example, those organized around service delivery, mutual support, campaigning, membership, advocacy, emergency response, etc., require different models of volunteer management to achieve greater participation and effectiveness, and how "success" might be defined and measured across such substantial differences in program structure and context.

A final, broad question builds on this foundation. If a goal of volunteer involvement is to strengthen and expand civil society, what are the most efficacious means to increase volunteerism? At the societal level governments would seem to possess a variety of policy tools, such as statements of volunteer policy, exhortations by elected and appointed leaders, volunteer service programs, and provisions in the tax code. An array of more specific means are available at the community level, such as voluntary action centers (or volunteer centers) to sort and match people's interests in volunteering with suitable placements, service-learning, and other volunteer opportunities required or recommended in the schools, faith-based volunteer initiatives organized and supported by religious institutions, and business investment of contributed time and money in civic projects and goals.

Surveys of volunteer participation and behavior alone, such as those examined and referenced in this essay, have limited ability to address the future directions for research anticipated in this chapter. To provide a more complete understanding, companion studies are needed on volunteer-involving organizations and their volunteer programs, including the approaches, means and personnel used to engage, motivate, retain, and manage these vital human resources. Supplementing the surveys on volunteerism with this research would greatly contribute to the knowledge of volunteers and volunteering in civil society.

Cross-References

▶ Altruism
▶ Citizenship
▶ Civic Action
▶ Civic Participation
▶ Corporation for National and Community Service
▶ United Nations
▶ Volunteer Management

References/Further Readings

Anheier, H., & Salamon, L. (2006). The nonprofit sector in comparative perspective. In W. Powell, & R. Steinberg, (Eds.), *The non-profit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 89–117). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Berger, G. (1991). *Factors explaining volunteering for organizations in general, and social welfare organizations in particular.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Waltham, MA: Heller School of Social Welfare, Brandeis University.

Brudney, J. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector: Planning, initiating, and managing voluntary activities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brudney, J. (1998). Voluntarism. In J. Sharfitz (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of public policy and administration* (pp. 2343–2349). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. (Reprinted from *Understanding nonprofit organizations*, pp. 320–323, by J. Ott, Ed., 2001, Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Brudney, J., & Gazley, B. (2006). Moving ahead or falling behind? Volunteer promotion and data collection. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 16*(3), 259–276.

Cnaan, R., & Amrofell, L. (1994). Mapping volunteer activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23*(4), 335–351.

Cnaan, R., Handy, F., & Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 25*(1), 364–383.

Corporation for National and Community Service (2007). *New federal report shows volunteering strong in America, but 1 in 3 volunteers dropped out in 2006*, from http://www.nationalservice.org/about/newsroom/releases_detail.asp?tbl_pr_id = 682; 11/01/2007.

Ellis, S., & Campbell, K. (2005). *By the people: A history of Americans as volunteers, new century edition.* Philadelphia: Energize.

Fixler, J., Eichberg, S., & Lorenz, G. (2008). *Boomer volunteer engagement: Collaborate today, thrive tomorrow.* Bloomington, IN: AurthorHouse.

Gazley, B., & Dignam, M. (2008). *The decision to volunteer: Why people give their time and how you can engage them.* Washington, DC: ASAE & The Center for Association Leadership.

Handy, F. et al. (2000). Public perception of "Who is a Volunteer": An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross-cultural perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organization, 11*(1), 45–65.

Heinrich, V. (Ed.) (2007). *Civicus global survey of the state of civil society, Volume 1, Country Profiles.* Bloomfield, NJ: Kumarian Press.

Hodgkinson, V. (2003). Volunteering in global perspective. In D. Paul & H. Loek (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 35–53). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

Hustinx, L., & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological modernization perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 14*(2), 167–187.

Independent Sector. (2002). *Giving and volunteering in the United States 2001,* from http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/gv01main.html; 07/17/2008.

Johns Hopkins University. (2007). *Putting volunteer work on the economic map of the world: Johns Hopkins, international labour organization, and United Nations join forces,* from http://www.jhu.edu/ccss/News%20Release%20JHU%20ILO%20agreement%20FINAL.pdf; 07/17/2008.

Kirsch, A., Hume, K., & Jalandoni, N. (2000). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey* (1999 ed.). Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Macduff, N. (2005). Societal changes and the rise of the episodic volunteer. In J. Brudney (Ed.), *Emerging areas of volunteering* (pp. 49–62). ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series, *1*(2).

McCurley, S., & Ellis, S. (2003). Thinking the unthinkable: Are we using the wrong model for volunteer work? *E-Volunteerism, 3*(1), from http://e-volunteerism.com/; 08/05/2008.

McCurley, S., & Lynch, R. (2005). *Keeping volunteers: A guide to retention.* Philadelphia: Energize.

Meijs, L. et al. (2003). All in the eyes of the beholder? Perceptions of volunteering across eight countries. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 19–34). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

Musick, M., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Salamon, L. (2007). *Measuring civil society and volunteering: Initial findings from implementation of the UN handbook on nonprofit institutions* Working Paper No. 23. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Salamon, L., & Sokolowski, S. (2001). *Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Evidence from 24 countries*, from http://www.jhu.edu/ccss/publications/pdf/cnpwp401.pdf; 07/17/2008.

Salamon, L., & Sokolowski, S. (2003). Institutional roots of volunteering: Towards a macro-structural theory of individual voluntary action. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 71–90). New York: Kluwer /Plenum.

Salamon, L., Sokolowski, S., & List, R. (2003). *Global civil society: An overview.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Smith, D. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23*(3), 243–263.

Urban Institute. (2004). *Volunteer management capacity in America's charities and congregations: A briefing report*, from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410963_VolunteerManagment.pdf; 07/17/2008.

US Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2008). *Volunteering in the United States, 2007* from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm; 08/05/2008.

Wing, K., Pollak, T., & Blackwood, A. (2008). *The nonprofit almanac: 2008.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Riecken, W., Ugur, G., & Wymer, Y. (1996). Determinants of volunteerism: A cross-disciplinary review and research agenda. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, 4*(4), 3–26.

VSSN

► Voluntary Sector Studies Network (VSSN)